

days—26th of October. Adjutant General notified me of this, but, fortunately, I had had four letters from him. He lies in a hospital at Brema, France. It may seem strange when I tell you I can stand this bravely. I'm proud of my boy, who stayed by his gun to the last (Field Artillery, Battery A, Forty-second Division), but when he was wounded he was among white, whole-hearted people, who are caring for him. He asks me not to worry. He's being given the best of care—a good bed, plenty to eat. If it's the Lord's will that he be not returned, I should grieve for him, but there would be no bitterness in my heart, and he died for his country, while with this boy the most bitter resentment would fill my life. But don't misunderstand me; my boy is no better than another mother's boy, if he was the good, noble boy this one is, and if they are protecting them. We know they are not feeding them, but why?

I appeal to you to find out, if you can, if these few men are to be left there to starve or be murdered. Everything may be all right, but it looks bad to me, and I feel I have a right to know. I do not seek his release, as many are, only his care and protection.

I answered her letter—

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. I am concerned, as well as other Senators, in getting exact information from Russia. In view of the letter which has just been read, perhaps it would not be out of place for me to say that no later than last night we had as our guest a young man who told us that he had heard from his brother, who was at Archangel and was one of the American troops. The letter was written not later than the latter part of November; he gave the date, but I do not now have it in mind. The gentleman stated that his brother spoke in most complimentary terms of the comfort and accommodations they have there. I simply speak of that for what it is worth.

Mr. KENYON. I am very glad to know that, and that may be some comfort to this poor mother who can get no word from the War Department.

The second letter reads as follows:

I have stood up under the stress of this Red Cross and all that goes with it most wonderfully, but this Russian terror and suspense of waiting and wondering why has taken my heart out of the work, or, rather, made me unfit for my position. I am sending you a letter from the Carroll County paper which tells of conditions that are most discouraging. This lieutenant has the same base, but not the company, with my son. I would never know from this son if he was starving. That's one reason why some one else should find out. Trust you will regard me as an anxious, loving mother and not a nuisance to you.

The last letter—and I think as to a portion of what the mother says in this letter the mantle of charity might be thrown over it if anybody has any criticism of it, because it is from a mother's breaking heart who has heard nothing of this boy of hers in months—personally I admire the spunk of the writer:

I read with much interest the demand of Senator TOWNSEND for the Michigan people concerning the Three hundred and thirty-ninth Infantry. It is true most of these men are from Detroit. The captain of this company made a special request—which is not considered allowable—that my son be transferred to his company, which, of course, was very agreeable to him. I notice Secretary of War Baker says he has never heard complaint. Well, perhaps they went where my letter went—to the wastebasket. At least I received no reply. And had he read it he could not have truthfully said what he did. Then he disclaimed knowing of influenza. If such be true, I think it time he began to find out. I think I sent you the letter received from my son, when he said 62 of their men—some of their best—died in four days after landing at Archangel. He also told of their second lieutenant being taken from the barge as they were going up the river and died three days later. I don't believe one of these deaths has been reported. I say again, we feel, and have a just cause to do so, these men were carted off up there without much thought as to what they were going for and forgotten, and some one will be asked, and demand, that we know why. And with all due respect to our President, I think no time should be lost to cable a demand that he pause in his receptions long enough to do something for our boys at once there. We visited Camp Custer a short time before they left for over. A more splendid body of men President Wilson will not meet in all his travel. The whole of Russia would not pay for one of their lives, as it is to-day or ever will be.

Then she speaks of other things and of an attack that her boy had written about long before it was to be made.

Mr. President, I feel that I am simply performing a duty to this mother of one of these boys and to the people of my State who have boys in Russia. They are not asking that any of their sons be relieved from performing any of the real duties of this war. They feel that this war is practically over or at least that the fighting is over, and they do not want these boys of theirs left up amid those snows and the terrors of Russia to meet the terror of bolshevism when it may not be necessary. If it is necessary, all that she asks and that they ask is that those boys have proper care and proper support, and the mothers of this Nation have a right to ask for that. We may well be careful that as this war closes we do not become forgetful of the boys who have made it possible for civilization. I agree with the words expressed here a few moments ago that we have nothing to do with the kind of government the people of Russia have. It is about time to be paying some attention to the United States of America and its people.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. THOMAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Before that motion is put, I wish to ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHAFROTH in the chair). In answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Texas, the Chair is informed that the bill is before the Senate and that the request of the Senator is not necessary. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 9, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 7, 1919.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

Huston Thompson to be a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

R. L. Williams to be United States district judge, eastern district of Oklahoma.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 7, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Come, Thou Almighty, with all Thy holy influence and make us one with Thee in thought and purpose in this epoch-making period in the history of the world.

Intense problems loom large before us and before all the civilized nations. Give us courage, patience, wisdom, strength, that we may uphold right and truth and justice; and guide, we beseech Thee, the great men who have been selected to form a peace pact, that it may unite the men of all nations into brotherly love; that the scenes which we have and are passing through may never disgrace mankind again. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF EX-PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.

The SPEAKER announced as the committee to attend the funeral of the late Theodore Roosevelt, Mr. KITCHIN, Mr. SHERLEY, Mr. WEBB, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. DENT, Mr. PADGETT, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. STEDMAN, Mr. ESTOPINAL, Mr. RIORDAN, Mr. McANDREWS, Mr. GALLIVAN, Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH, Mr. MANN, Mr. FORDNEY, Mr. GILLET, Mr. VOLSTEAD, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, Mr. KAHN, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MOTT, Mr. HICKS, Mr. CHANDLER of New York, Mr. CANNON, Mr. RODENBERG, and Mr. BOWERS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there appeared this morning in a Washington paper a tribute from ex-President Taft upon the late Col. Roosevelt. The tribute is so worthy of the writer and of Col. Roosevelt that I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by inserting an article by ex-President Taft on Col. Roosevelt. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, late a President of the United States.

Resolved, That a committee of 15 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of ex-President Roosevelt the Senate do now adjourn.

And that in compliance with the second resolution the Vice President had appointed Mr. LODGE, Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. REED, Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. HARDING, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. CALDER, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KELLOGG, and Mr. KNOX as said committee.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. DRANE, of Florida, was granted leave of absence indefinitely on account of illness.

RESIGNATION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., January 6, 1918.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you that I have tendered my resignation as a Representative from the fourth district of the State of New York to the governor of the State. The resignation is to take effect immediately.

Sincerely, yours,

HARRY HOWARD DALE.

The SPEAKER. Ordered filed among the archives of the House.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—WICKERSHAM AGAINST SULZER.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. WILSON at Louisiana. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the pending election contest.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the Alaska contest case. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. When the House adjourned Saturday the previous question was ordered on these resolutions and also on the motion to recommit. Of course the motion to recommit is voted on first and the Clerk will report the motion.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present. However, Mr. Speaker, I prefer the point should be raised on the vote.

The SPEAKER. That is the easiest way. The Clerk will report the Burnett motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BURNETT moves to refer the contested-election case of James Wickersham, contestant, against Charles A. Sulzer to the Committee on Elections No. 1 and said committee shall report on said case by or before February 10, 1919.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 131, nays 187, answered "present" 1, not voting 112, as follows:

YEAS—131.

Alexander	Crisp	Hensley	Overstreet
Almon	Crosser	Holland	Padgett
Aswell	Curry, Cal.	Huddleston	Pbelan
Ayres	Davey	Hull, Tenn.	Polk
Bankhead	Dent	Igoe	Rainey, H. T.
Barkley	Denton	Jones	Rainey, J. W.
Barnhart	Dill	Kehoe	Raker
Bell	Dixon	Kincheloe	Randall
Benson	Doollittle	Larsen	Rayburn
Blackmon	Doughton	Lazaro	Romjue
Bland, Va.	Eagan	Lee, Cal.	Rouse
Blanton	Eagle	Lee, Ga.	Rucker
Bowers	Evans	Lever	Sanders, La.
Brodbeck	Fields	Linthicum	Saunders, Va.
Buchanan	Fisher	Lockett	Shallenberger
Burnett	Flood	Loback	Shouse
Byrnes, S. C.	Foster	Lonergan	Sims
Byrns, Tenn.	Gallagher	Lundeen	Sisson
Caldwell	Gallivan	Lunn	Smith, T. F.
Candler, Miss.	Gandy	McAndrews	Snook
Cantrill	Gard	McKeown	Stegall
Caraway	Garner	McLemore	Stedman
Carlin	Garrett, Tex.	Mays	Stephens, Miss.
Church	Godwin, N. C.	Miller, Wash.	Sterling
Clark, Fla.	Goodwin, Ark.	Montague	Stevenson
Claypool	Gray, Ala.	Neely	Sumners
Cleary	Hamlin	Oldfield	Taylor, Ark.
Coady	Hardy	Oliver, Ala.	Thomas
Collier	Harrison, Miss.	O'Shaunessy	Tillman
Cox	Heflin	Overmyer	Vinson

Walton
Watkins
Watson, Va.

Weaver
Webb
Welling

White, Ohio
Wilson, Tex.
Wingo

Wright
Young, Tex.

NAYS—187.

Anderson	Fess	Lampert	Sanford
Anthony	Focht	Langley	Schall
Austin	Fordney	Lehibach	Scott, Mich.
Baer	Foss	Leshner	Sears
Beakes	Frear	London	Sells
Beshlin	Freeman	Lufkin	Sherwood
Birch	French	McCulloch	Siegel
Bland, Ind.	Fuller, Ill.	McFadden	Sinnott
Booher	Garrett, Tenn.	McKenzie	Small
Britten	Gillett	McKinley	Smith, Idaho
Browne	Glynn	McLaughlin, Mich.	Snell
Browning	Good	Magee	Snyder
Butler	Gordon	Mann	Stafford
Campbell, Kans.	Gould	Mapes	Steele
Cannon	Graham, Ill.	Martin	Steenerson
Cary	Green, Iowa	Mason	Stiness
Chandler, N. Y.	Greene, Mass.	Merritt	Strong
Chandler, Okla.	Greene, Vt.	Moore, Pa.	Sweet
Clark, Pa.	Griest	Moore, Ind.	Taylor, Colo.
Classon	Hadley	Morgan	Temple
Connally, Tex.	Hamilton, Mich.	Nelson, A. P.	Thompson
Cooper, Ohio	Haskell	Nelson, J. M.	Tilson
Cooper, Wis.	Hastings	Nicholls, S. C.	Timberlake
Copley	Haugen	Nolan	Towner
Crago	Hawley	Norton	Treadway
Cramton	Hayden	Osborne	Vare
Dale	Hayes	Paige	Vestal
Dallinger	Hersey	Parker, N. J.	Voigt
Darrow	Hicks	Parker, N. Y.	Volstead
Davis	Hilliard	Peters	Walker
Dempsey	Hollingsworth	Platt	Walsh
Denison	Houston	Porter	Ward
Dewalt	Hull, Iowa	Pou	Wason
Dickinson	Humphreys	Powers	Watson, Pa.
Dies	James	Purnell	Wely
Dillon	Johnson, Wash.	Ramsey	Whaley
Domink	Juul	Ramseyer	Wheeler
Doremus	Kahn	Rankin	White, Me.
Dowell	Kelley, Mich.	Reavis	Williams
Dupré	Kelly, Pa.	Reed	Wilson, Ill.
Edmonds	Kennedy, Iowa	Rodenberg	Wilson, La.
Elliott	King	Rogers	Winslow
Ellsworth	Kinkaid	Rose	Wood, Ind.
Esch	Knutson	Rowe	Woods, Iowa
Fairchild, B. L.	Kraus	Rubey	Woodyard
Fairfield	La Follette	Sanders, Ind.	Zihlman
Farr	La Guardia	Sanders, N. Y.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Slayden

NOT VOTING—112.

Ashbrook	Ferris	Kettner	Riordan
Bacharach	Flynn	Key, Ohio	Robbins
Black	Francis	Kless, Pa.	Roberts
Borland	Fuller, Mass.	Kitchin	Robinson
Brand	Garland	Kreider	Rowland
Brumbaugh	Goodall	Little	Russell
Burroughs	Graham, Pa.	Longworth	Sabath
Campbell, Pa.	Gray, N. J.	McArthur	Scott, Iowa
Carew	Gregg	McClintic	Scott, Pa.
Carter, Mass.	Griffin	McCormick	Scully
Carter, Okla.	Hamill	McLaughlin, Pa.	Shackelford
Connolly, Kans.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Madden	Sherley
Cooper, W. Va.	Harrison, Va.	Maher	Slemp
Costello	Heaton	Mansfield	Sloan
Currie, Mich.	Heintz	Miller, Minn.	Smith, Mich.
Decker	Helm	Mondell	Smith, C. B.
Delaney	Helvering	Moon	Stephens, Nebr.
Donovan	Hood	Morin	Sullivan
Doolling	Howard	Mott	Swift
Drane	Husted	Mudd	Switzer
Drukker	Hutchinson	Nichols, Mich.	Tague
Dunn	Ireland	Oliver, N. Y.	Templeton
Dyer	Jacoway	Olney	Tinkham
Elston	Johnson, Ky.	Park	Van Dyke
Emerson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pratt	Venable
Esen	Kearns	Price	Waldow
Estopinal	Keating	Quin	Wise
Fairchild, G. W.	Kennedy, R. I.	Ragsdale	Young, N. Dak.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. SLAYDEN (for motion to recommit) with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. KEATING with Mr. HUSTED.

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. BACHARACH.

Mr. HELM with Mr. KLESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. GOODALL.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. ROBBINS.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. GARLAND.

Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. BURROUGHS.

Mr. ASHBROOK with Mr. COOPER of West Virginia.

Mr. BLACK with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. ELSTON.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. HARRISON of Virginia with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. HELVERING with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
 Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. HUTCHINSON.
 Mr. KETTNER with Mr. IRELAND.
 Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 Mr. MOON with Mr. LONGWORTH.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. OLIVER of New York with Mr. MUDD.
 Mr. OLNEY with Mr. SWIFT.
 Mr. PARK with Mr. TINKHAM.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. WALDOW.
 Mr. TAGUE with Mr. MCARTHUR.

The SPEAKER. On this vote the yeas are 131, nays 187, present 1. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?
 Mr. POU. I rise to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANN. There is a question pending.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved,

1. That Charles A. Sulzer was not elected a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the Territory of Alaska in this Congress and is not entitled to retain a seat herein.

2. That James Wickersham was duly elected a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the Territory of Alaska in this Congress and is entitled to a seat herein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, is it too late to ask for a separation of those two questions?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

The question is on demanding the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 229, nays 64, answered "present" 13, not voting 125, as follows:

YEAS—229.

Anderson	Fisher	Lea, Cal.	Sanders, N. Y.
Anthony	Focht	Lehlbach	Saunders, Va.
Aswell	Fordney	Lever	Schall
Austin	Foss	Little	Scott, Mich.
Baer	Frear	Lobeck	Sells
Beakes	Freeman	Loneragan	Shallenberger
Beshlin	French	Lufkin	Sherwood
Birch	Fuller, Ill.	McAndrews	Shouse
Bland, Ind.	Gallagher	McCulloch	Siegel
Bland, Va.	Gallivan	McKenzie	Sinnott
Booher	Gandy	McKeown	Small
Britten	Garner	McKinley	Smith, Idaho
Browne	Garrett, Tenn.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, T. F.
Browning	Gillett	Magee	Snell
Buchanan	Glynn	Mann	Snook
Butler	Good	Mapes	Snyder
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodwin, Ark.	Martin	Stafford
Campbell, Kans.	Gordon	Mason	Steele
Cannon	Gould	Merritt	Steenerson
Cary	Graham, Ill.	Miller, Wash.	Stephens, Miss.
Chandler, N. Y.	Green, Iowa	Mondell	Sterling
Chandler, Okla.	Greene, Mass.	Montague	Stiness
Clark, Pa.	Greene, Vt.	Moore, Pa.	Strong
Classon	Griest	Moore, Ind.	Summers
Cleary	Hadley	Morgan	Sweet
Connally, Tex.	Hamilton, Mich.	Neely	Taylor, Ark.
Cooper, Ohio	Haskell	Nelson, A. P.	Taylor, Colo.
Cooper, Wis.	Hastings	Nelson, J. M.	Temple
Copley	Haugen	Nicholls, S. C.	Thompson
Crago	Hawley	Nolan	Tilson
Cramton	Hayden	Norton	Timberlake
Crosser	Hayes	Olney	Towner
Dale	Hensley	Osborne	Treadway
Dallinger	Hersey	O'Shaunessy	Vare
Darrow	Hicks	Paige	Vestal
Davis	Hilliard	Parker, N. J.	Volgt
Dempsey	Hollingsworth	Parker, N. Y.	Volstead
Denison	Houston	Peters	Walker
Denton	Hull, Iowa	Phelan	Walsh
Dewalt	Hull, Tenn.	Platt	Walton
Dickinson	Humphreys	Porter	Ward
Dies	Igoe	Pou	Wason
Dillon	James	Powers	Watson, Pa.
Dixon	Johnson, Wash.	Purnell	Welty
Dominick	Juul	Rainey, J. W.	Whaley
Dowell	Kehoe	Ramsey	Wheeler
Dunn	Kelley, Mich.	Ramseyer	White, Me.
Dupré	Kelly, Pa.	Randall	Williams
Eagan	Kennedy, Iowa	Rankin	Wilson, Ill.
Eagle	King	Rayburn	Wilson, La.
Edmonds	Kinkaid	Reavis	Winslow
Elliott	Kutson	Reed	Wood, Ind.
Ellsworth	Kraus	Rodenberg	Woods, Iowa
Esch	La Follette	Rogers	Woodyard
Fairchild, B. L.	LaGuardia	Rose	Young, Tex.
Fairfield	Lampert	Rowe	
Farr	Langley	Rubey	
Fess	Lazaro	Sanders, Ind.	

NAYS—64.

Alexander	Claypool	Hedin	Overstreet
Almon	Coady	Huddleston	Raker
Bankhead	Collier	Jacoway	Romjue
Barkley	Cox	Jones	Rouse
Bell	Curry, Cal.	Key, Ohio	Rucker
Benson	Davey	Kincheloe	Sanders, La.
Blackmon	Dent	Larsen	Sisson
Blanton	Dill	Lee, Ga.	Steagall
Bowers	Evans	Leshner	Stevenson
Brodbeck	Fields	Linthicum	Tillman
Burnett	Gard	Littlepage	Vinson
Caldwell	Garrett, Tex.	Lundeen	Watkins
Candler, Miss.	Gray, Ala.	Lunn	Welling
Cantrill	Hamlin	Mays	Wilson, Tex.
Caraway	Hardy	Moon	Wingo
Church	Harrison, Miss.	Oldfield	Wright

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—13.

Barnhart	Crisp	Polk	White, Ohio
Byrns, Tenn.	Flood	Rainey, H. T.	
Carlin	Foster	Watson, Va.	
Clark, Fla.	Holland	Weaver	

NOT VOTING—125.

Ashtbrook	Flynn	London	Sanford
Ayres	Francis	Longworth	Scott, Iowa
Bacharach	Fuller, Mass.	McArthur	Scott, Pa.
Black	Garland	McClintic	Scully
Borland	Godwin, N. C.	McCormick	Sears
Brand	Goodall	McFadden	Shackleford
Brumbaugh	Graham, Pa.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sherley
Burroughs	Gray, N. J.	McLemore	Sims
Campbell, Pa.	Gregg	Madden	Slayden
Carew	Griffin	Maier	Slemp
Carter, Mass.	Hamill	Mansfield	Sloan
Carter, Okla.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller, Minn.	Smith, Mich.
Connolly, Kans.	Harrison, Va.	Morin	Smith, C. B.
Cooper, W. Va.	Heaton	Mott	Stedman
Costello	Heintz	Mudd	Stephens, Nebr.
Currie, Mich.	Helm	Nichols, Mich.	Sullivan
Decker	Helvering	Oliver, Ala.	Swift
Delaney	Hood	Oliver, N. Y.	Switzer
Donovan	Howard	Overmyer	Tague
Dooling	Husted	Padgett	Templeton
Doolittle	Hutchinson	Park	Thomas
Doremus	Ireland	Pratt	Tinkham
Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Price	Van Dyke
Drane	Johnson, S. Dak.	Quin	Venale
Drukker	Kahn	Ragsdale	Waldow
Dyer	Kearns	Riordan	Webb
Elston	Keating	Robbins	Wise
Emerson	Kennedy, R. I.	Roberts	Young, N. Dak.
Essen	Kettner	Robinson	Zihlman
Estopinal	Kiess, Pa.	Rowland	
Fairchild, G. W.	Kitchin	Russell	
Ferris	Kreider	Sabath	

So the resolutions were agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota (for) with Mr. SLAYDEN (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. SIMS with Mr. LONGWORTH.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. MANN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolutions were agreed to was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND THE FUNERAL OF EX-PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker of the House may be made a member of the committee to attend the funeral of the late President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman makes that request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POU). The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the name of the Speaker of the House be added to the committee which, by the direction of the House, will attend the funeral of ex-President Roosevelt. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order to-morrow may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the business in order to-morrow may be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RELIEF IN EUROPE.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13708) providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary.

Be it enacted, etc., That for the participation by the Government of the United States in the furnishing of foodstuffs and other urgent supplies, and for the transportation, distribution, and administration

thereof to such populations in Europe, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President from time to time as necessary, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, in the discretion of the President, \$100,000,000, which may be used as a revolving fund until June 30, 1919, and which shall be audited where practicable in the same manner as other expenditures of the Government are audited: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall be reimbursed so far as possible by the Governments or subdivisions thereof or the peoples to whom relief is furnished: *Provided further*, That a report of the receipts and expenditures under this appropriation shall be submitted to Congress not later than the first day of the next regular session.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I did not catch the gentleman's request.

Mr. SHERLEY. It was for unanimous consent for consideration. I was about to make a statement to the House.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, if unanimous consent should be granted, it was my intention, having consulted with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], the ranking Member of the Committee on Appropriations, to ask that two hours and a half be given for consideration, and that at the end of that time the previous question should be considered as ordered and a vote had upon the passage of the bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state, I think, that the time is satisfactory to him.

Mr. LITTLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman one question. I notice this relief is confined entirely to Europe. There are several million Armenian Christians on the borders of Europe. How does it happen that they are not included in this measure?

Mr. SHERLEY. The request that came by virtue of the cable from the President to the Secretary of the Treasury, and which was transmitted to the House, and which is found in House Document 1640, confined it to Europe, as the bill does, and in the absence of a specific request for funds to be expended outside of Europe the committee would not feel warranted in going beyond the request.

Mr. LITTLE. Would not the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations accept and agree to an amendment including Armenia?

Mr. SHERLEY. I would not feel warranted at this time to announce that I would accept such an amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. The people of this country are being asked for many millions for that purpose, and I think that that neighborhood is more needy than any other.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman's request propose to exclude the opportunity of offering amendments? I did not quite catch it.

Mr. SHERLEY. As submitted, it would simply bring the matter up for a direct vote as proposed. I do not know that I have any special desire to curtail opportunity to offer amendments. It is desired, if possible, to complete the consideration of this bill in time to enable several of us to leave for New York. But, of course, that, while it is a personal reason, is not a sufficient reason for any particular rule.

Mr. LITTLE. I would like to finish my inquiry. In view of the fact that Armenia is a Christian people, as much distressed and more distressed than any that will be involved in this measure in Europe, and in view of the fact that more efforts are being made to secure from the people of America by free gifts and contributions aid for Armenia than for any other country, I shall have to withhold my consent unless some arrangement is made to include Armenia in this bill or opportunity to put it in.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman will appreciate that I am not in a position to undertake to get unanimous consent by terms such as he proposes. I might be in entire sympathy with the gentleman's proposal, and yet in the absence of more information touching the matter I would not feel warranted, on behalf of the committee, in saying that I would agree to an amendment of that kind.

Mr. LITTLE. I understood the gentleman's request was that this bill should be passed without any opportunity for amendment.

Mr. SHERLEY. I simply offered a proposal of that kind. If the House does not desire to do that, why the matter can be thrown open to amendment. I realize both the importance of the matter and the very proper desire of the House to consider it fully. I have no wish to interfere with that desire in any way.

Mr. LITTLE. If the gentleman from Kentucky will modify his request so as to afford opportunity for amendment, I will not object; but if he will not, I shall object.

Mr. SHERLEY. My request, which is pending, is for consideration, and does not involve the question of amendments at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood the gentleman to say that at the end of the debate the previous question would be ordered.

Mr. SHERLEY. I said I should like to request that. I suggest that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] state his position touching the matter.

Mr. GILLETT. I have been trying to get an opportunity to do that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I understand this is a request for unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that, for one, I am opposed to this resolution, and I suggested to the gentleman from Kentucky—with which suggestion he entirely agreed—that this is a matter of such momentous importance that the House ought to have opportunity for full consideration and debate. Now, I say this in all fairness to the House, so that if there are any Members who wish time against the resolution they may be forewarned: This request has just been presented, and already enough gentlemen have spoken to me to consume the entire 1 hour and 15 minutes which would be allotted to me in opposition; so that if there are other Members, as very likely there may be, who wish time on either side of the House in opposition to the resolution—for in the committee the opposition was not partisan—I shall be unable to give it to them. Therefore, if there are other gentlemen, the time for debate ought to be extended.

Mr. GORDON. I should like 10 or 15 minutes against this proposition.

Mr. LANGLEY. I should like to have some time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In view of the fact that this is a request for unanimous consent, and that it involves a tax of \$1 per capita on every man, woman, and child in the United States, for purposes not fully explained, I object. We have a great deal of distress and suffering in the United States.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will reserve his objection for a moment—

Mr. SEARS. Regular order!

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will withhold his objection—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will not withhold my objection to unanimous consent to take \$100,000,000 and give it to people in unknown lands for unknown purposes. The time has come to put a stop to this universal altruism, which takes money out of our Treasury.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I am not asking him to support the bill. I am asking him to withhold his objection in order to allow me to make a statement to the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Certainly, I will do that.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will try not to delay the House unduly.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. SHERLEY. I shall not take over five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly apparent that, irrespective of whether individual Members may favor or oppose this proposition, it is of sufficient magnitude and importance to America and to the world to deserve the consideration of the House of Representatives. Now, there are two methods by which that consideration can be secured. It can either be taken up by unanimous consent or it can be made in order under a rule. We are in a short session of the Congress, in which, with our very best efforts to accommodate the various views of Members on different subjects, we will have difficulty in disposing of the most important business. Being personally responsible for the presentation of a considerable part of that business to the House, I should like to save unnecessary work in connection with the consideration of matters that will have to be considered. I think it is easily within the strong probabilities that in the absence of unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, its consideration can and will be made in order by the machinery of a rule. It seems to me that as practical men there is nothing to be gained by forcing the aid of that machinery in order to consider this proposal. I do not want it considered by the House in any way except fully and fairly, and in such manner as to reflect the judgment of the House, and all I desired this morning was to get it up for consideration, and then I would try to adjust the matter of terms to the desires of the House. May I suggest this: Would it meet the views of the gentleman if consent was given to take up the matter immediately after the reading of the Journal upon Thursday? I am willing to agree to any proper

debate, and, under the five-minute rule, it would be subject to any germane amendment.

Mr. GILLETT. I suggest to the gentleman that he give the day of Thursday to it. That is not unreasonable in a matter of this importance.

Mr. SHERLEY. My only hesitancy about it is that we are getting well along into January, this Congress will die on the 4th of March, and there are a great many bills of importance to be considered. The Committee on Military Affairs have a number of bills to present, and important supply bills are yet to be considered. I want to accommodate the House. I submit, gentlemen, in all fairness, with a sober appreciation of the responsibility that rests upon us as individuals, that we must all forego somewhat of our natural desire for debate in the consideration of matters if we are to begin to do the business that presses before Congress.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. In regard to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky fixing Thursday for the consideration of this matter, I want to ask him whether or not he would consent that it should be taken up after the disposition of the bill now pending for the settlement of contracts in which a great many American citizens are deeply interested.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will excuse the Chair, the Chair will state that the arrangement is that to-morrow, having dispensed with calendar Wednesday, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW] will be recognized to bring in a rule in regard to the bill the gentleman from Illinois refers to.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, we have had that understanding for a number of days, but one thing and another has intervened, and we have got no action. For one I shall object to the consideration of a bill of this character when our own people are so deeply interested in the contract bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will not the gentleman concede that since there is great distress prevailing among families of the soldiers and sailors of the United States who have offered their lives in the service abroad, there is ample business for the President and the Congress to do in the United States without taxing the people another hundred million of dollars to involve us further in foreign affairs?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not desire to take the time of the House now to discuss the merits of the proposal. Sufficient to say that in my judgment this proposal, aside from the humanitarian aspect, which is such that it necessarily appeals to all humane men, has in it to my mind more of value in helping to bring about actual peace in the world and thereby relieve the United States of the burden of war than any proposal likely to come before Congress now or in the future. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it the judgment of the gentleman from Kentucky that the United States should of itself donate this \$100,000,000 and to continue to donate other sums for the relief of all the people of all the earth for all time?

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to the gentleman that we ought not to enter into a discussion of the merits of the bill at this time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Kentucky has stated the sympathetic side, and I am stating that this money comes out of the bone and sinew of the people of the United States.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to suggest to the gentleman that I agree with him entirely that there is pressing business before Congress, and that we all ought to suppress our love for debate as much as we can. On the other hand, I think the gentleman will admit that no more far-reaching and important proposition probably will come before us than this proposition of the United States entering into and becoming the great almoner of the poor of Europe. It seems to me that one day for its consideration will not be too much.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will agree to do this if it meets with the approval of the House: If the bill from the Military Affairs Committee, the contract bill, shall not have been concluded before Thursday, that immediately after its conclusion this bill shall be taken up, with two hours of debate on a side, and that it shall then be read under the five-minute rule for amendment.

Mr. GILLETT. I think that is reasonable.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, after the consideration of the military contract bill, if that bill should be pending, and if not, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the bill which I have just had read at the Clerk's desk be taken up for consideration; that there shall be two hours' debate on a side, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT]

and one half by myself; that after the conclusion of the general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment and final passage, and that general debate be limited to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that next Thursday, at the conclusion of the military contract bill, if that bill is still pending, or if that is out of the way, as soon as the Journal is read and matters on the Speaker's table are disposed of, this \$100,000,000 charity proposition be taken up; that there shall be two hours' debate on each side, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] and one half by himself; and that then the bill be taken up for amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this proposition involves an increase of taxation on our already heavily taxed people, and I think they ought to have time to reflect upon it. I object.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I desire to serve notice that I shall ask the Committee on Rules for a rule for the consideration of the bill, and I trust that it will be presented to the House on Thursday.

SWEARING IN OF A DELEGATE.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I present the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM], who has just been seated by a vote of the House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office prescribed by law.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GREGG (at the request of Mr. SLAYDEN) was given leave of absence indefinitely on account of illness.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR TO-MORROW.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GARRETT, to preside as Speaker pro tempore to-morrow.

PAYMENT OF ALLOTMENTS OF ENLISTED MEN.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and take up out of its order the bill (H. R. 13306) to authorize the payment of allotments out of the pay of enlisted men in certain cases in which these payments have been discontinued, and put the same on its passage, with the amendments of the committee. The bill has been unanimously reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13306) to authorize the payment of allotments out of the pay of enlisted men in certain cases in which these payments have been discontinued.

Whereas in the act known as the act to authorize the establishment of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department provision was made for the payment of allotments to the beneficiaries indicated in a proper authority of allotment by the men enlisted in the military service of the United States; and

Whereas under this provision many enlisted men filed the proper papers authorizing such payments with the Bureau of War Risk Insurance; and Whereas in these cases and pursuant to this authority payments were regularly made to the beneficiaries up to July 1, 1918, by this bureau; and Whereas as of that date the payments of allotments not carrying allowances was ordered to be discontinued pursuant to the recommendation of the War Department pending the receipt of a new authority of allotment from the enlisted man; and

Whereas many of these new authorities have never been received by the War Department, owing to the inability of the parties in interest to communicate with the soldiers; and

Whereas the discontinuance of the payment of these duly authorized allotments has operated to the very great detriment and suffering, in many cases, of the allottees; Now, therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That in all of those cases in which an authority of allotment by an enlisted man directing the payment of an indicated amount to a designated beneficiary is on file in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and payments pursuant to this authority had been made by said bureau prior to July 1, 1918, but which payments were discontinued as of that date, the War Department is directed to resume the payments of allotments in these cases, pursuant to the authority on file as aforesaid, pending the receipt of a new authority, or of a written rescission of the old authority, from the enlisted man. In those cases in which, pending the receipt of the new authority, the military authorities, beginning with July 1, 1918, have reserved from month to month out of the soldier's monthly accruing pay the amount directed to be paid by the original authority of allotment, the War Department, upon resuming the payment of allotments in such cases, under the authority of this act, shall pay all arrearages out of these respective reservations.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the bill, but so that we may have a hearing I demand a second.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] 20 minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief statement in connection with this bill, one which I hope

will make it abundantly clear why it was necessary that the bill should be introduced, and why it should be passed. Since the introduction of this bill, which was primarily intended to meet the situation arising in my own district out of the action of the War Department, I have received letters from many portions of the United States, showing the suffering of large numbers of allottees arising out of this ill-advised discontinuance of the payment of soldiers' allotments not carrying allowances. There are very many thousands of these cases. Members of this House are doubtless aware that in the act creating the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, the soldiers were authorized to make allotments out of their pay to such persons as under the regulations might be designated by them as allottees and that a further provision was made that in case of certain dependents, the Government would supplement this allotment with an allowance. I wish to say in this connection that my bill does not deal with those allotments that carry allowances, but is concerned exclusively with allotments without allowances. It was provided in the act to which I refer, that the payments of these allotments should be made under regulations agreed upon and promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of War. These regulations were promulgated, and conformably thereto the payment of allotments was begun in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and continued therein for some time. Prior to July 1, last, the War Department for reasons best known to itself, decided to recommend the discontinuance of the payment of all allotments that did not carry allowances, and to require a new authority of allotment from the soldier. The result of that action has been, as doubtless has been made clear to Members of the House by hundreds of letters from their constituents, that payment of very many of these allotments which was in progress of payment as of July 1 last, was not only discontinued as of that date, but has never been resumed.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Can the gentleman give any reason why the War Department discontinued the payment?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The War Department has never afforded any reason for its recommendation of discontinuance which was satisfactory either to the Members of Congress, or to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which considered this bill. This department gave out a reason to the following effect, that the discontinuance and taking over of the payment of these allotments by the War Department, was rendered necessary by virtue of some supposed amendment to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance Act passed by this body. I undertake to say in this connection that no such amendment was ever passed, and that this House at no time, either consciously, or unconsciously, has done anything which made this action necessary on the part of the War Department.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. This bill provides for the payment of these claims which were discontinued in the War Risk Insurance Bureau and authorized to be transferred to the Quartermaster General of the Army?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The War Department had the right to take over the payment of these allotments. This jurisdiction originally belonged to the War Department, and there would not have been the slightest objection to its taking over the payment of the allotments if, after taking over that jurisdiction, or resuming it on their part, it had continued to make payment in those cases in which payment had begun, and for which sufficient authority was on file in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. This bill relates only to those cases in which actual payments under the authority of regulations promulgated by the War and Navy Departments, were in progress in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The delay was caused by the discontinuance in the War Risk Bureau, directing them to be paid by the Quartermaster General.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. In part by the discontinuance of payment in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and in further part by the failure of the War Department to continue the payment of the discontinued allotments. No payments have been made since July 1, except in cases where a new authority has been afforded.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. And they have been unable to get that new authority.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. In many instances, they have been unable to do so. Some of the soldiers sought to be reached were in prison, some of them were missing, and some of them were dead. I wish to say that it is a fair estimate to assume that to-day there are from one to five million dollars in the hands of the War Department which have accrued in consequence of this discontinuance of payment. This will give some idea of the extent of this mischief.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I have many cases of this kind: A private soldier allotted to his mother, dependent upon him, \$15, with the statement that he had contributed that amount. They paid his mother not only that \$15 but \$15 more, as I recollect the case. The mother was asked subsequently, after 6 or 8 or 10 months, what he had contributed theretofore, and the answer came that he had contributed \$25 a month. Now, then, they have stopped paying her and demand that she shall refund the money and are taking his allotment of \$15 month by month to reduce that amount that had been advanced to the mother. Does this bill apply to such cases?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, that while I am familiar with cases of the character cited, because I imagine every Member of this body has cases of that sort, this bill does not apply to that situation, for the reason that payments in those cases are still being made in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. This bill applies only to the payment of allotments not carrying allowances, the jurisdiction of which has been assumed by the War Department. I will say to the gentleman that the situation to which he refers is doubtless met by a bill that is now before, if it has not been reported, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and which was introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. This bill does not deal with that situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the phraseology of the measure, would it permit payment of allotments in those cases where since July 1, 1918, the allotments have not been reserved by the War Department?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why in that particular should the Government pay money in cases where the money has not been reserved by the Government from the soldier's pay?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am very glad the gentleman has asked that question, for the reason that it affords the opportunity in this connection to show that the difficulty raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin, is not a real difficulty. If the gentleman will read the bill he will find that the bill relates to two situations of fact. First, to those cases in which the allotment payments were in progress as of July 1 last, and in which the War Department from that time forward, has reserved out of the soldier's pay the amounts necessary to pay the allotments.

Mr. STAFFORD. There can be no objection to that phase of the question.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Permit me to conclude. There are many cases of that sort. I have in my pocket now numerous letters written to me by mothers, and other allottees in regard to discontinued allotments, to the effect that their sons have written to them to inquire whether their allotments were being regularly paid, and stating further that the amount necessary for the payment of same was being taken out of their monthly pay. In these cases the gentleman will see that the bill provides that upon the resumption of payment of allotments under the old authority which is now on file in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and which is available to the War Department, it shall pay all arrearages. This is entirely proper, because the money for that purpose is in the hands of the War Department. Now take those cases in which the War Department has not reserved out of the soldier's pay the amount fixed in the original authority of allotment. The bill prescribes that upon resumption of payment, the War Department in these cases shall pay from that time forward, and pay only the amount carried by the authority of allotment. This statement answers I think the query of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is that phraseology? I have read the bill very carefully. I notice in the report the gentleman commented on that phase:

Since the discontinuance of the payment of allotments on July last, in many if not all of these cases, the necessary amount to meet the designated allotment has been reserved out of the soldier's pay.

Where in the bill does it provide for the protection of the Treasury in the way indicated by the gentleman?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. In this way: The bill provides that—

In all those cases in which an authority of allotment by an enlisted man directing the payment of an indicated amount to a designated beneficiary is on file in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and payment pursuant to this authority has been made by said bureau prior to July 1, 1918, but which payments were discontinued as of that date, the War and Navy Departments are directed to resume the payment of allotments in those cases, pursuant to the authority on file as aforesaid.

That is to say, under that authority the department upon the resumption of payments, would pay the monthly allotments only from that time forward. In order to make it abundantly clear

that in those cases the department will not pay arrearages, you will notice the following language in the next sentence:

Pending the receipt of a new authority, or of a written rescission of the old authority from the enlisted man. In those cases in which pending the receipt of the new authority, the military authorities, beginning with July 1, 1918, have reserved from month to month out of the soldier's monthly accruing pay, the amount directed to be paid by the original authority of allotment, the War and Navy Departments, upon resuming the payment of allotments in such cases, under the authority of this act, shall pay all arrearages out of these respective reservations.

The two paragraphs taken in connection make it very clear that arrearages are to be paid only in those cases in which the War Department has reserved the amounts necessary to meet them.

Mr. STAFFORD. But under the phraseology of this bill payment may be made to allottees where the allotment is no longer being reserved by the Government?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not think so at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. The report says it may be payable in such cases. Where is the language to prevent it?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have pointed out that the War Department is to resume payment under and by virtue of existing authorizations which fact, in itself, would carry the idea that the payments would be from that time forward, but in order to make it further clear that arrearages shall not be paid in those cases in which the soldier has been paid his monthly pay in full, the bill directs that arrearages shall be paid in those cases only in which reservations have been made. Any bureau head, or other official who would undertake to pay arrearages under this bill in those cases in which arrearages have not been reserved out of the soldier's pay, ought to be promptly separated from the service of the Government.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman tell the House of the inadequate method employed in informing soldiers that they were required to make a new allotment?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes; I will say to the gentleman that under the authority of the original act, hundreds of thousands of soldiers all over the United States filed the proper authorizations with the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, directing allotments to be paid out of their pay. Payment of these allotments had begun in many, many of these cases prior to July 1, last. Then when the War Department took over this jurisdiction, which I admit belonged to the War Department, it discontinued payment of every soldier's allotment not carrying an allowance, without regard to what had been in progress before that time. The department took up these cases with the organization commanders at home, and in France, and directed them to call the attention of the soldiers to the fact that a new authority of allotment was necessary. Having in mind the uncertainty of the mails, and the difficulty of reaching the soldiers abroad, and the further fact that many of these organization commanders were carrying very acute responsibilities in connection with the actual conduct of operations in the field, the House will be very well able to understand that there are to-day thousands of soldiers who have not only never filed a new authority of allotment, but who have not been made aware of the fact that it was necessary to file any such authority.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. DOWELL. I am heartily in favor of this proposition, but it occurs to me it might be limited by the language of this bill. I notice in the bill this language:

And payments pursuant to this authority which had been made by said bureau prior to July 1, 1918.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Now, assuming that the allotment was properly filed originally and that no payments had been made prior to July 1, the application in such a case will not receive attention under the bill?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is true, and these cases were intentionally omitted because I did not wish to complicate the bill by including any matter with respect to which the War Department might raise difficulties. I have limited the bill to the cases which have been adjudicated, and with respect to which payments were actually in progress on July 1 last.

Mr. DOWELL. Will it not be for cases that have not been paid?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It will not affect them at all. All those cases are now in the War Department. With respect to these cases the soldiers will have to proceed by securing a new authority.

Mr. DOWELL. Should not the bill provide, or should not there be an amendment to the bill providing, that these applica-

tions that have been filed should be considered by the department as though filed since that time, and should not those applications, which I know take in a great number, and which will be deprived of having the consideration of the department, have the same consideration by the department?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not think that you should complicate this bill by adding a situation with respect to which there is likely to be controversy. By adding such a situation an excuse for delay will be afforded. If you desire to reach those cases you can do so by another bill. I am not prepared to say with respect to the suggestion made by the gentleman that it ought to be agreed to in this offhand way. The situation outlined in this bill calls for no investigation, because there is no controversy as to the facts.

Mr. DOWELL. There is no question but this bill should pass, but I wanted to include the others.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I desire to say further that I had a hearing on this bill before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Gen. Lord was there. An effort has been made to fix the responsibility for this discontinuance upon Congress. Doubtless every Member has received letters from the War Department or letters from that department have been forwarded by our constituents, in which it was stated that this discontinuance was due to some act, or amendment on our part. I desire to repeat the statement that I heretofore made, that there is not a line in any bill passed by Congress that made necessary the discontinuance of these payments.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the War Department in the hearing attempt to give the reason why these allotments had been stopped and the payments to the soldiers in some cases discontinued and kept out of the pay of the soldier and in others were paid to the soldier?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That particular feature was not developed, and I wish to say that I have the letter of the Secretary of War that was sent to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In this letter he undertakes to discuss this entire situation and to furnish reasons for the action of the War Department. The amendment that we are supposed to have passed was in June, 1918, and this letter of the Secretary of War relates solely to the legislation of 1917. The act of 1918, as I have stated, could not possibly have made necessary the discontinuance of payments of allotments not carrying allowances, and the claim is not even made in the letter of the Secretary.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman intend to read the letter?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not care to do so. If anyone desires to read it, I will hand it to him. It is a three-page letter. It may be put in the Record if anyone wishes that action to be taken.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. ESCH. Had the War and Navy Departments accepted certified copies of the allotments that had been filed with the War Risk Insurance Bureau, would there have been this difficulty?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will say in response to that question, that in every one of the cases covered by this bill there is on file a sufficient authority of allotment in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. All the War Department needed for the purpose of continuing to make payments with respect to any one of these cases, was to secure a copy of the appropriate authorization from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If there are any further questions to be asked, I would like five additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman be allowed to conclude his remarks.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will be very glad to answer any additional questions.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman incorporate the letter from the War Department in the Record?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the letter to which I referred be made a part of my remarks in this connection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the letter from the War Department be incorporated in his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I find that not all of those who write to me are in that particular difficulty. By what principle do they determine who should be turned over to the War Department and who should yet be retained in the War Risk Insurance Bureau?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That was determined in this way. The allotments that carried allowances were paid in part out of the Treasury of the United States. Hence the appropriate jurisdiction in those cases belonged to the Treasury Department, as the Bureau of War Risk Insurance is a branch of that department; but where the allotment is paid entirely out of the pay of the soldier, the jurisdiction in regard to that case appropriately belongs to the War Department.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Why did they not take over all the allotments paid, then, rather than a part of it?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. As I have stated, the War Department took over the cases which belonged to its jurisdiction, and they were the cases of allotments which did not carry allowances. It could not take over the payment of allotments carrying allowances, for the reason that such cases were within the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. FIELDS. There were a great many cases that were not adjudicated at the time that this transfer was made, although the soldier had been inducted into the service and had filed his application for the allotment. Does the bill under consideration in any way direct the War Department to accept those applications filed with the Bureau of War Risk Insurance?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It does not deal with unadjudicated or possibly controverted cases. It deals exclusively with those cases with respect to which there can be no controversy.

Mr. FIELDS. Would it not expedite the matter to add an amendment to the bill directing the War Department to accept this as proper authority for the consideration of the claims?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I think that such action would complicate the matter.

Mr. FIELDS. I do not see how that can complicate the matter. What is the difference between an application filed somewhere in France and forwarded here and an application filed with the commanding officer of the soldier at the time he enlisted, which went to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance? Either one is a proper authority for investigation as to whether or not the beneficiary is entitled to an allotment, and if the soldier is earning the pay and allots \$15 of it a month to his mother or some other dependent or relative, there is not very much controversy about it, and that would result in the settlement of these cases, whereas as the matter now stands, they will probably never be settled.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If the War Department desires to settle such cases it can do so by its own action. I have estimated that of these discontinued cases there must be at least 50 in each congressional district. Many of the Members of the House have told me that this is far too low an estimate.

Mr. FIELDS. I wish there were only 50 in my district.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I understand that in many districts the number is believed to be many more than 50, but I have put it at 50. If there are only 50 to a district, averaging the country through, that would make about 20,000 of these discontinued allotments. If we estimate that the average allotment in these cases would be \$10, that would make an aggregate discontinuance of \$200,000 a month, and inasmuch as six months have elapsed since this order began to operate, there must necessarily be in the hands of the War Department something like \$1,200,000 which ought to have been paid over long since to the allottees of the soldiers. If there are a greater number of these cases in the districts than my estimate assumes, and there are no authentic figures on the subject, the amount due the deferred allottees will be proportionately increased.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be given an additional minute. I want to ask him a question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in accord with the statement of the gentleman from Virginia. I was present at the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, waiting to be heard on a bill of mine, also an amendment to the War Risk Insurance act, and I now would ask that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] accept the proposition as contained in my bill as an amendment to his bill if it is brought up at the present time for consideration.

The point of my bill, Mr. Speaker, is this: There have been innumerable cases where the War Risk Insurance Bureau or the War Department have asked for a refund from the relatives of the soldier. That refund they have asked under clause 210 of the War Risk Insurance act, which provides for reexamination by questionnaires, or otherwise, as the bureau may direct. Now, those refunds could come about in three different ways: First, by the payment of cash by the people who received the benefit of the allotment and allowance; second, by deducting the amount from the allowances that may in the future be paid or may not up to that time have been paid; and third, by charging it against the soldier's allotment. All three of these methods seem unfair to the soldier; but the third course is the one to which I most particularly object. An allotment from the soldier is nothing more nor less than the soldier's request that his pay be transferred to his relatives through the War Risk Insurance Bureau or through the War Department or Navy Department. It is his absolute pay, and he could have it paid to him direct, rather than paid by the departments if he so desired. Now, then—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TREADWAY. In just one moment, if I may proceed. The War Department or the War Risk Insurance Bureau, if the case preceded last July, has notified people that they would receive no more allowances, and in addition to that say, "Unless you pay back this money in cash, we will charge it against the soldier's allotment." That is what I object to; that the soldier's own pay should be taken for a revision of the allowances already made by the department.

Now, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to inquire as to the number of the gentleman's bill and whether it has been reported?

Mr. TREADWAY. My bill is H. R. 13273. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] if he would be willing to accept, as an addition to his bill, my bill as an amendment thereto; that is, to incorporate my bill with his?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Has your bill been reported?

Mr. TREADWAY. It has not been reported by the committee, and the reason why it has not been acted upon by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is that they some time ago, at the time of our hearing, asked the War Department for its views on the measure, which have never been submitted. They again asked yesterday for the views of the department. I have had a communication with Mr. Nesbit in reference to the proposition contained in the bill, and I would be glad to submit extracts from a letter I have received from him.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. In a moment. For instance, I read this:

The discontinuance of the family allowance in cases of this character works a great hardship and causes a great deal of complaint. The bureau, however, has no discretion in the matter because the allowance under the law as it stands does not exist, and therefore can not be paid.

The bureau takes the attitude that it is acting within the law in charging back these amounts against the men paid. I have talked with Assistant Secretary Love, who has had charge of the War Risk Bureau, and he said it was up to the department to execute the law as interpreted by the bureau, but it was up to Congress, if it desired, to change the law. And that is what we should do. The bureau originally made these allowances and allotments and the people accepted the payments in good faith. If future examination on the part of the bureau or the department shows that the allowance should not have been paid, then start your slate from the time of the reexamination. Begin your bookkeeping when they change their ruling, and not charge back over a period of a year or more against the man's pay or allowance which the dependents of the soldier have already expended.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. MANN. I am sorry, but I have promised all my time. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of the passage of this bill. I think it might be well to explain to the House the reasons which were given by the War Depart-

ment and by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance for this transfer. The reasons did not appear to me to be sufficient, and it does not seem to me that the department ought to have ordered the transfer; yet I think the House is entitled to a statement of those reasons, for whatever they may be worth.

You will recall that the war-risk act itself did not confer upon the War or Navy Department the power to retain allotments, nor it did not confer upon soldiers the power to make allotments. That power already existed in the War and Navy Departments. There have been for some years provisions of the law authorizing men in the Army and the Navy to make allotments through the War and Navy Departments, so that the War and Navy Departments already had authority to make allotments to relatives wherever they were designated by the soldier or sailor. The war-risk insurance act did not take that authority from the War Department, but conferred it in addition upon the War Risk Insurance Bureau, so that in the execution of the law the Bureau of War Risk Insurance found itself authorized to deduct these allotments and pay them, and the War Department itself had the same authority. They began to confer one with the other, and by the 1st of July they had arrived at the conclusion that in all cases where the allotment carried no allowance the War Department ought to resume the jurisdiction which it already had independent of the war-risk insurance act, and all of the allotments which were in that situation were turned over to the War Department. The mistake that the Bureau of War Risk Insurance made, and that the War Department made, was in not accepting the allotments made by the soldier originally, and having either a certified copy of that allotment sent from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to the Quartermaster General's office, or having the original papers sent from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to the Quartermaster General's office; and when the question was asked Gen. Love as to why that was not done, he said the Auditor for the War Department took the position that the War Department had no authority to pay an allotment unless it came through the War Department.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McFADDEN. How many claims are pending affected by this bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. My recollection is that the estimate of Gen. Love, who had charge of this matter, was that there were something over 200,000 claims of this sort that were affected, but that the increase in the number of allotments that came through the War Department following the issue of this order amounted to something like 200,000; and they were only able to account for this additional 200,000 by assuming that they were reallocations, made by the soldiers who had been able to receive the notices which they sent out; but it is very probable that there are 20,000 to 25,000, or perhaps more, who are affected by this bill, where the men in France or in Russia or in Belgium or Italy or in hospitals or German prison camps were never able to receive the notices and are still under the impression that their relatives are receiving the allotments, whereas they are not receiving them.

Mr. McFADDEN. So that there are probably a quarter of a million dependents who are not receiving the allotments which have been made to them by soldiers?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; there are not a quarter of a million, because probably 200,000 have made new allotments, and that would leave perhaps twenty-five to thirty thousand soldiers whose allotments are not being received by their relatives.

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. IGOE. Did the Quartermaster General on July 1 allow this \$15 to go back on the man's pay, or did he continue to hold it out in all cases?

Mr. BARKLEY. They held it for a reasonable time, as they estimated it, to give the soldier a chance to make a new allotment, and where they did not receive the new allotment they began after a while to pay him the full pay.

Mr. IGOE. What did they do with the pay that they had held up? Did they pay it to him?

Mr. BARKLEY. They paid it to him after the 1st of July. There was no back pay prior to that date.

Mr. IGOE. That which they had held up?

Mr. BARKLEY. If they held up the July pay and the August pay, then, in September and October, if they did not receive a new allotment, they assumed that the man did not intend to make a new allotment and paid him the back pay. Perhaps in some cases, where they have not been able to reach the man, they have not paid it, but the War Department takes the position that in all these cases where they have been able to reach the man and no new allotment has been made it is not his inten-

tion to make a new allotment, and they have paid him the entire amount of his pay.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the intention to pay the beneficiary or allottee money that has not been reserved?

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. That would seem to be so from the phraseology of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not the intention, and I think there should be added these words, page 2, after the word "cases," in line 11, "from the passage of this act," or some words like that, so as to indicate that it was not retroactive as to allotments not held in reserve.

Mr. STAFFORD. There should be some such amendment in order that there shall be no double pay.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Has the gentleman seen a letter from the War Department saying that the action was due to some kind of amendment to the war-risk act passed by Congress?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I have not seen it; but I have received word from several Members who have received some such letter. I do not know who sent such a letter. There was no amendment to the War Risk Bureau act that would warrant that. It was an administrative matter worked out by the War Risk Insurance Bureau and the War Department.

Mr. DENISON. I have received a number of such letters.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not undertake to say just where the blame lies, but it has been a gross and burning outrage that under such legislation as was enacted, under the administration efforts of various departments, men who were enlisted in the Army, either by voluntary enlistment or under the selective-draft law, were told that they could allot a part of their pay to help sustain dependents upon them while the soldiers were away from home, either in camp training in this country or on the other side in the fighting line or in training there, and having been told that and having made the allotment and having had the amount of their allotment deducted from their own pay, after fighting over there, coming home, such as have come home, and others who want to come home, find out that this great and good Government of ours lied to them, has not kept faith with them, has not kept the promises which were made to them—that having deducted the amount from their own pay failed to make the payment to the mother or the father or the brother or the sister or the children, as it might be, who were dependent upon them for support. These people at home, or some of them, have suffered for food; many have suffered for raiment; many have suffered for heat; and many have been taken care of as a matter of charity by their neighbors or the Red Cross.

During a long experience in this House I have discovered that a great duty of the executive branch of the Government is not to do a thing but to give excuses why it does not do it. Here the War Risk Bureau was making the payments, theoretically, and if they made them regularly they did better than they are doing now, and somebody transferred the making of the payments to the Quartermaster General's office of the Army, and while the Quartermaster General's office of the Army knows enough about it to deduct the amount of the allotment from the soldier's pay, it does not know enough about it to warrant it to pay the amount deducted to the dependent parents. Nothing more ridiculous could be imagined. Somebody ought to be blamed for it. This bill seeks to cure it as a legislative proposition. I do not know, but I assume that probably it does not require legislation. It is proper to have legislation because that is a direction. We ought to go further. I appreciate the great trouble of developing a wonderful, complete organization in a short time. No doubt the War Department had a tremendous responsibility in developing this organization. The War Risk Insurance Bureau had a great responsibility in developing its organization. Both of them have miserably failed, so far as the payment of soldiers' allotments to their dependents is concerned. It is a disgrace to a civilized community that we are about to consider a bill to appropriate \$100,000,000 for the benefit of the poor in Europe—I think we ought to pass that bill—while at the same time we have not developed the machinery to pay the money to the poor people at home who under the law are entitled to it as a part of the pay which the Government has provided for its men in the military service. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do that under a motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the bill as it now stands the words on page 2,

line 11, after the word "cases," the words "from and after the passage of this act."

Mr. STAFFORD. Would it not be as well to insert the provision that only where the allotment has been withheld?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to make the language he has just stated a part of the bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, what is the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. Page 2, line 11, after the word "cases," insert the words "from and after the passage of this act."

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not think that would add anything to it and I object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would it not be as well to have it apply only in cases where the allotment has been reserved or withheld? It is not intended to pay double, it is only intended to pay where the money has been withheld out of the soldier's pay, and yet here is a direction on the part of Congress to pay in cases where the money has been paid back to the soldier.

Mr. BARKLEY. That might carry the implication that the War Department would pay back only that which has been withheld and the intent is to resume these payments from month to month in the future.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that would add anything and I therefore object.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to make the proposition that the Clerk will read a part of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add as a new section the following:

"Provided, however, That whenever the commissioner shall by further investigation or reinvestigation modify the existing award, no reimbursement from the person receiving an allowance shall be required for allotments and allowances already paid nor shall any deductions be made from allotments and allowances to be paid in the future for any change in award made in previous allotments and allowances."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire whether under the phraseology of the amendment just offered it would not legalize the payments made under fraudulent representations. There have been called to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance numerous instances where persons have perpetrated fraud on the Government in receiving these allowances. By this phraseology you would prevent the Government from obtaining money back which has been unlawfully paid, and for that reason I object.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold it for a moment?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer the following amendment:

In line 14, page 2, after the word "cases," insert the word "only."

I understand the gentleman from Virginia is willing to accept that amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to having the word "only" inserted?

Mr. MANN. Let it be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DEMPSEY offers the following amendment: Page 2, line 14, after the word "cases," insert the word "only."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman to tell us what that means. I am not always able to catch what the insertion of a negative means at first blush.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin has raised an objection that under this bill there might possibly be payments made of arrearages where the arrearages had not been deducted from the soldier's pay. To make it clear that the payment of arrearages shall be made only where they have been actually deducted, I put in the word "only," which, it seems to me, more clearly confines it to the cases contemplated, which are those where the arrearages have been actually deducted.

Mr. MANN. But the bill apparently only authorizes payment where the amount has been reserved.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think myself that the bill is plain without the insertion.

Mr. MANN. The most dangerous thing I know of where you have a matter that is fairly clear is to insert a negative. I do

not myself deem that it is necessary. There is a constant query about the meaning of double negatives. Most people who use them do not mean an affirmative, yet they say that it constitutes an affirmative.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I agree with the gentleman. I think the language is plain without the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Then I shall object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia to suspend the rules and pass the bill as amended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman have any objection to modifying his motion so as to strike out the whereases?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the whereases in this case recite a state of facts which makes it abundantly clear to anyone why the bill is necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. The whereases should be a part of the report, but not a part of the permanent statutes of the country.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill, the amendments being a part of it.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

INVESTIGATION OF LIGNITE COAL.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3220) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals and peat to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products, as amended by the Committee on Mines and Mining of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRISP). The gentleman from Arkansas moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make experiments and investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals to determine the commercial and economic practicability of their utilization in producing fuel oil, gasoline substitutes, ammonia, tar, solid fuels, gas for power, and other purposes; and there is hereby appropriated, out of the funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be needed, to conduct such experiments and investigations, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and including supplies, equipment, expenses of traveling and subsistence, and for every other expense incident to this work.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell or otherwise dispose of any property, plant, or machinery purchased or acquired under the provisions of this act, as soon as the experiments and investigations hereby authorized have been concluded, and report the results of such experiments and investigations to Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin 20 minutes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that this proposition was discussed very fully on another bill a few weeks or a couple of months ago, when a similar item was included in a bill which passed the Senate and which subsequently was abandoned in the Senate—one of the war bills. The bill as it passed the Senate included peat, and one of the House amendments is to cut out peat. The bill as it passed the Senate provided \$150,000 as a fund. The House amendment cut the fund down to \$100,000. In addition to that, the House committee proposed an amendment as a new section, section 2:

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell or otherwise dispose of any property, plant, or machinery purchased or acquired under the provisions of this act as soon as the experiments and investigations hereby authorized have been concluded, and report the results of such experiments and investigations to Congress.

Now, broadly speaking, the object of the bill is simply to do this: To enable the Department of the Interior to conduct certain experiments, or, rather, to demonstrate by the establishment of plants that which laboratory experiments have already demonstrated, the feasibility of developing the lignite coal deposits of this country which constitute one-third of the coal deposits of the United States. There are something like 7,000,000,000 tons estimated in Alaska alone of lignite. There is a great deal more of these lignite deposits upon Government land that still remains as part of the public domain. Now, as I said, the laboratory experiments which have been conducted have all demonstrated the feasibility of the use of these lignites not only as fuel but in the carbonizing of lignite to develop oils and other matters contained in them which have a high commercial value. Now, some objection was offered once before on this proposition on the ground that it was a paternalistic proposition, but it

is just the contrary. The object of this bill is to demonstrate the commercial practicability so that private enterprise will be induced, as it is in other countries, to take up the lignite deposits of our country. Now, the question may be asked why, if other countries have developed the commercial operations by which their lignite deposits are utilized in a practical commercial way, we can not benefit by their experiments and use the processes which they have developed. The reason for it is this: The lignite deposits of this country are in a different state of development from those in Germany, in Canada, and in other countries where they have developed practical processes. And you understand lignite is just a condition of development of coal from the original state; it has not yet reached the highly developed state which produces bituminous or anthracite coal. Now, in Germany their lignite had proceeded to a natural development to an extent that is different from the lignite of the United States. They found by laboratory experiment that it was a commercial and practical proposition, and the Government expended money to demonstrate it to the commercial interests of Germany, and the result was to make the status of the lignite of that country for fuel; and the development of the gases and the oils of the lignite deposits of Germany constitute the base of the German monopoly for dyestuffs up to the time the war opened. Now, those of you who have read the report will find on page 5 of the report listed under six different subheads the uses and the qualities which are contained in lignite and which we wish to develop to commercial use.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield before going from that?

Mr. WINGO. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. I notice what seems to me rather a singular omission in the language of the bill. It nowhere states where these investigations are to be carried on. They are not limited to the United States and they do not include the Territories, and it seems as if this is left open for the investigation to be carried on anywhere in the world. Of course, I suppose there is no intention or purpose but that under the terms of this bill these operations shall be carried on anywhere except in the United States and its Territories?

Mr. WINGO. The hearings before the committee and the information I have lead me to the conclusion, perhaps, that they will establish one plant in one of the Dakotas—North Dakota. Now, the question raised had not occurred to me before, and I will frankly state I do not think there is any intention to go outside of the United States, unless it is necessary for the investigators for the purpose of comparison to go into Canada, the Saskatchewan district, where they conduct similar work.

Mr. TOWNER. Of course, I suppose the principal lignite deposits that are likely to be beneficial are in Alaska?

Mr. WINGO. No; the gentleman is mistaken there. I should think—

Mr. TOWNER. The Matanuska fields or the lignite fields south of Fairbanks are—

Mr. WINGO. There are great deposits in Alaska.

Mr. TOWNER. The largest lignite fields in the world?

Mr. WINGO. They are the largest individual deposits. Take the deposits of the West and Southwest together, I think possibly they outrank in volume any known deposits of Alaska, although Alaska has the largest single deposit of lignite in the world.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to ask the gentleman another question. Of course, there is a very great deal of difference with regard to the different lignite coals. It does not mean an absolute uniform and valuable fuel producer. There are various degrees of lignite just as there are of bituminous coal and of varying value. Is it the purpose of this bill to allow investigation to be made of various fields and reports to be made regarding their comparative value?

Mr. WINGO. No; I will state to the gentleman, if the gentleman will pardon my interrupting, I have only a few minutes, I promised to yield some of my time—and I would like to be notified when I have used 10 minutes—I will say this to the gentleman. The object we are seeking to do is this, because we have practically located these different lignite fields.

But the object of this is to follow up the laboratory experiments and by putting in a small plant demonstrate from a commercial standpoint the feasibility and the practicability as a profit-making proposition of the utilization of these lignite deposits. That is the object, and the sole object.

Mr. TOWNER. Does not the gentleman think that the amount, \$100,000, for that purpose is somewhat large?

Mr. WINGO. No; I think not.

Mr. TOWNER. If it is merely the object by chemical experiment to determine the value of lignite for the purpose of using it, it seems to me that is a large amount.

Mr. WINGO. I do not think you could test out the plants for \$100,000. I think that amount is too small. I think it should be \$150,000.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has used nine minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, so that we may have further information concerning this bill, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota before I speak in opposition to it.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill proposing an appropriation of a hundred thousand dollars to be used for experiments and investigations to be carried on by the Bureau of Mines for the purpose of determining and demonstrating the feasibility and commercial practicability of carbonizing and briquetting lignite coal. This Senate bill as amended by the Committee on Mines and Mining is substantially the same as the bill H. R. 12192, which I introduced in the House on this subject and on which bill hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Committee on Mines and Mining on June 7 of this year. During the past 15 years there have been carried on in the Northwest, and in the State of North Dakota particularly, a series of experiments and investigations to determine the commercial and economic practicability of using lignite coal and its by-products. During that time there has been a great deal of private capital put into different plants constructed for briquetting lignite coal on a commercial basis. In practically every case so far the investments in these briquetting plants have been commercial failures. For the most part the men who ventured in this work of the briquetting of lignite coal and the manufacture of by-products from the briquetting process did not have either sufficient capital or information on the subject of briquetting lignite to carry on the work to a final and commercial success.

The Bureau of Mines now represents that it can with this appropriation demonstrate to the commercial world that the briquetting of lignite coal and the use at the same time of the by-products of this coal are practical and feasible from a commercial point of view. The bureau intends to use this money in cooperation with some private plant that has already been established either in North Dakota, Colorado, or Texas.

Let me again call your attention, gentlemen of the House, to the immediate and tremendous importance of developing this great natural resource of our country—lignite coal. It is estimated that in the United States there is more than a trillion tons of lignite coal; more than one-third of all the coal in the United States and Alaska is lignite coal. Let me particularly mention just one feature of the possibilities in the development of this low-grade coal. Investigations that have already been made show that as a by-product from a ton of lignite coal there can be secured about 4 gallons of light oils that can be used in internal-combustion engines. This means that the light oils from lignite coal, and that can be secured from it in briquetting processes, are sufficient to meet the needs of the United States for 150 years, whereas the known or estimated amount of gasoline that can be secured from the petroleum fields of the country will only meet the demands of the United States for about the next 25 years. That is one important feature of this work that will be more fully presented to the country by the experiments and investigation to be carried on under this proposed appropriation.

Another great feature is the transportation problem. To-day there is being shipped from Ohio and from other distant fields more than 7,000,000 tons of bituminous coal to the State of Minnesota.

If this lignite coal industry is developed, if the way is pointed out by the United States for private enterprise to engage in this industry, as I believe it should be, instead of transporting coal 1,500 or 2,000 miles into Minnesota it will be brought down there from the great coal fields of North Dakota, which are distant only a few hundred miles. That alone will mean a great economic saving in transportation. It will also allow of needed conservation of coal in Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, where the coal fields are being rapidly exhausted. To-day throughout North Dakota there can be seen fields of this coal varying in depths from 20 to 40 feet. One of the principal items in any after-war program for progressive development in this country should be the development and expansion of the use of lignite coal and its by-products. Up in Canada they have recently appropriated \$400,000 to develop the use of lignite coal there. Have we not every reason to do more to develop the use of this product in the United States.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. NORTON. I want to add that I believe that as a conservation measure that this is one—

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota two minutes.

Mr. NORTON. That this is one of the most important measures that have come before this great Congress, which has had so many great measures before it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. NORTON. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. What I am trying to get at is, Is there machinery at present under the Bureau of Mines by which this investigation can be made?

Mr. NORTON. The bureau has practically all the machinery that is needed. It can secure machinery for this purpose, or nearly all it will need, I know, in my State.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Have they made any of these tests? Has any bureau of the Government made any of these tests so that information is available?

Mr. NORTON. Yes; test experiments and investigation have been made in the laboratory and field work for a number of years.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Why is it necessary to make this large expenditure at this time for this investigation? Perhaps I did not notice your argument closely enough, but in a few words I would like to have you explain why it is necessary to appropriate this sum now?

Mr. NORTON. The bureau estimates that it will need this amount to establish a briquetting plant for the manufacture of lignite briquettes and by-products. Through the establishment of such a plant and its successful operation the bureau promises that it will demonstrate to the commercial world that it is practical to put upon the market at a profit these briquettes and the by-products of lignite coal given off in the manufacture of the briquettes, these by-products being light oils, tars, and gas.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman have any idea of where the department expects to locate this plant?

Mr. NORTON. I have no definite idea. I think they will locate the plant, although they have not so stated, either at Hebron, N. Dak., in connection with the Bureau of Mines station of the State of North Dakota, or at Minot, N. Dak., where there is a private briquetting plant at the present time, in which a large amount of money has been invested.

Mr. LOBECK. The lignite fields extend into Wyoming.

Mr. NORTON. They extend from Canada down through the Dakotas and into Colorado and into Texas. There are some very large fields in Texas.

Mr. LOBECK. I have seen 30 or 40 foot veins in Wyoming.

Mr. NORTON. Along the Missouri River one can see for miles many coal seams or veins having a thickness of 20 to 40 feet. It would be very unwise statesmanship to fail at this time to have the Federal Government take action such as proposed in this bill for the development and use of these great coal fields.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is recognized. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 13 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, here we have an example of the Government going wild in Government ownership. I contend that with the authority the Bureau of Mines now possesses, similar to the authority possessed by the Bureau of Standards, of making laboratory tests to determine the practicability of these various by-products of lignite coals, it is unwise as now proposed by this bill that the Government should go into the business of establishing a commercial plant. Originally they sought \$150,000, and now \$100,000 is sought by this ambitious Bureau of Mines. If it were for the purpose of merely laboratory work, I would not rise here to oppose it, but when the Government for the first time in its history is attempting to establish a commercial plant to demonstrate to the country at large whether it is economical, practical, and profitable to sell these by-products, I say in these piping times of peace we should call a halt. Perhaps to the gentlemen who compose the Bureau of Mines \$100,000 is not much, but hundreds of thousands of dollars run into millions. They admit that investigations that have been made show that lignite can be made into briquettes; investigations show that oil can be extracted from lignite. Yet the report admits that the one purpose of this appropriation is for the Government to establish a commercial plant to determine whether it is commercially feasible. Section 2 embodies that idea of the purpose and provides that as soon as the plant is established and it is shown that the commercial project is a failure then authority is granted to them to dispose of the plant.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not just at this time. In the estimate—and, of course, I know, because I, too, have had experience of

some time in this House with bureau chiefs and know that they are inclined to expand their activities—in this estimate of \$100,000 they want \$10,000 for a building for a commercial laboratory. Of course \$10,000, when we are going to appropriate \$100,000, is not much. Then they want \$10,000 additional for a tar still, tar being a by-product of lignite. Then they want \$19,000 for salaries of experts, and all manner of estimates are provided for, including carbonizing ovens, a by-product, \$25,000.

It is not necessary for the Government by experiment to spend \$25,000 for the establishment of carbonizing ovens. They can go to any industrial center of the country where they are extracting by-products from soft coal and manufacturing coke, and they will see there the processes of extraction without the Government wasting \$25,000 in that particular.

Mr. WINGO. Is the gentleman talking about carbonizing lignites now? What has the coke proposition to do with it?

Mr. STAFFORD. It is akin. This process, as the gentleman himself has admitted, has been demonstrated to be practical in Germany, and I am informed also in France. Yet you want the Government now, in these times when we need money so badly, to establish a plant out in North Dakota and Alaska or somewhere else.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. I am interested in the discussion of the coke activities of the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not say anything about the coke activities of the Bureau of Mines at all. I said anybody acquainted with the commercial and industrial activity in the manufacture of coke would know that it is not necessary for the Government to establish carbonizing ovens to obtain a knowledge of that product.

Mr. WINGO. That may be true, but the items that the gentleman is reading will come up for appropriation in Pennsylvania and Illinois and possibly Arkansas. But none of it has to do with lignites.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman seems to be all wise about this subject when he says it has not anything to do with lignite. I will read the estimate. It says, "Lignite investigations, Bureau of Mines, \$100,000."

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman read about the coke ovens.

Mr. STAFFORD. I decline to yield further, because I can not afford to have all the time taken up by the gentleman in attempting to give information that he does not have. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury says that this is for lignite investigations of the Bureau of Mines, "for investigations of lignites, to determine the commercial and economic practicability of their utilization in producing smokeless fuels for household and industrial uses, gas for domestic and power purposes, nitrogen products for refrigerating or fertilizing purposes, fuel oils for furnaces and internal-combustion engines, and so forth, creosoting oils, benzene, toluene, and other materials required in the manufacture of dyestuffs and explosives and related chemical products, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, but not exceeding 20 per cent to be expended for such services in the District of Columbia, \$100,000."

In specifying the expenditure of that \$100,000 the Secretary of the Treasury has enumerated how that money is to be expended, and we find in the way of equipment, carbonizing ovens, a by-product, \$25,000 is estimated; and yet the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] has the temerity to rise here when he reports the bill, in a report covering many pages—10 pages—and say this \$25,000 is not for the purpose of experimentation, so far as lignites are concerned. I know there are lignite deposits down in Arkansas, and I know there are lignite deposits up in North Dakota, and I know that there are some in Alaska and in Texas, and I am not surprised that the Representatives of those States are coming here and trying to reach their hands into the Treasury to get \$100,000 for the beginning of an industrial and commercial establishment. I say we should enter a protest here and now at this time against this extravagant policy of going into the business of establishing private plants to determine whether it is commercially and industrially advantageous to extract these various by-products from lignite coal.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman reserves four minutes and a half.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] three minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. DENISON. Gentlemen of the House, I do not think the fears of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] are well founded. Section 2 was placed in the bill by the House com-

mittee in order to meet the situation he suggested. The purpose of this act is not to establish a commercial plant, but to demonstrate to the commercial world that this lignite can be utilized. If the lignite that is now known to be available in this country can be briquetted and made into a commercial fuel, the fuel supply of the country will be increased by a third. It can not be successfully briquetted unless the valuable by-products are reclaimed and utilized. The by-products themselves are very valuable and very much needed. Now, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Bureau of Mines to conduct experiments for the purpose of demonstrating that by saving and utilizing the by-products lignite can be made into a cheap but valuable fuel coal.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman read the report?

Mr. DENISON. Oh, I am a member of the committee, and was present during the consideration of the bill, and know all about it.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was stated that that was the purpose, to establish a commercial plant.

Mr. DENISON. It is only for the purpose of establishing a plant to develop the by-products, in order to demonstrate to the business interests of the country that this lignite can be utilized commercially. Now, the Committee on Mines and Mining, I think at my own suggestion, put this section 2 into the bill in order to anticipate and avoid the suggestion that the gentleman from Wisconsin has made, that this is a Government ownership experiment. This second section of the bill makes it mandatory upon the Bureau of Mines, after they have gone ahead and made their experiments and developed the lignite as far as they can under the appropriation, to dispose of any plant or other property that they may acquire in making the demonstration and make a report of their experiments and demonstrations to the Congress. So that this money will be taken by the Bureau of Mines and used to demonstrate to private individuals and to the business interests of the country whether or not lignite can be developed and made a merchantable product. In order to do that you have got to develop the by-products. The Bureau of Mines has not now the necessary machinery or funds to do that. They told the committee that when lignite is properly briquetted it becomes a clean fuel, with the same heat value as anthracite coal.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman cite any instance where the Government has undertaken a similar work in the development of any other natural resource?

Mr. DENISON. I am not able to do so, because I am not familiar with all the activities of the Government. Inasmuch as there is an immense quantity of this lignite in this country, which is being used in Germany and other countries, the committee thought it was at least worth the attention of the Government, and that this amount of money might well be used to demonstrate whether or not this product can be used commercially in this country. That is the reason why we approved of the bill. I think section 2 protects the Government and the people against any effort on the part of the Bureau of Mines, or anyone connected with the bureau, to try to put the Government into the business, because after the bureau has made the experiment and demonstration the bill compels the bureau to dispose of the plant and go out of the business. If the Government can demonstrate to the business interests of the country that lignite can be economically made into a good commercial fuel, we will have made a valuable investment in expending the amount authorized in this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Arkansas has nine minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin four and a half minutes.

Mr. WINGO. I suggest to the gentleman that he use his time now.

Mr. STAFFORD. There will be only one speech. Will there be only one on the other side?

Mr. WINGO. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN].

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I want to say only just a word or two in explanation of this bill. I think perhaps I ought to say that in all my experience here I have never approached the study of a proposition with as little preconceived opinion or anything that might influence or prejudice me for or against a proposition as I have the study of this bill. When the matter came up I hardly knew that there was such a thing as lignite. I knew absolutely nothing about it. There is none of it anywhere in my section of the country that I know of, and therefore I was prepared to study the question with an open mind. I have tried to give this matter pretty careful investigation and study. I believe that it is a question possessing a great deal of merit from many standpoints. Un-

questionably there is nothing in the apprehension voiced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. There was no idea or intention on the part of the Committee on Mines and Mining to have the Government go into anything that would savor of Government ownership.

Briefly this state of facts exists: North Dakota, through her university, has been making some experiments in the treatment of the lignites and has equipped a kind of plant for carrying on that work. Now, as I understand, the Government is proposing to join with them in this work of demonstrating the feasibility and practicability of the treatment of lignite in a commercial way. Now, the proposition as I understand it is, if this small appropriation is made, for the Government to join with the authorities of North Dakota and perhaps some other places in the country and erect a plant, putting in the necessary ovens and machinery to demonstrate physically the feasibility of treating these lignites in such a way as to induce private capital to take up the work on a large and commercial scale.

The Bureau of Mines believes that the by-products can be made to pay more than the expense of the treatment of coals. After separating the by-products it is the intention to briquette the carbon. Then you will have a fuel that is about equivalent to anthracite in heating units. It was testified before the committee that the experiments conducted so far have convinced the experts that after you have extracted the by-products, the oils, the tars, gases, and so forth, all of which are valuable and are badly needed in this country, the fuel part, the carbon, can be briquetted and placed on board the cars at \$4.50 a ton, and having a heating capacity equivalent to that of anthracite. If that can be done, that thing alone will be worth many millions of dollars to the people throughout the United States.

But aside from that, we all recall that in the beginning of this war we were told that we could not buy clothing of as good quality as we bought before, because of our inability to manufacture the dyes that would hold their color, and so forth, and that because these things had come from Germany heretofore and we were to be deprived of them, we were forced to use inferior stuff in the way of clothing. I believe that great benefits will come from this horrible war just closing, and I believe that one of those benefits arises from the fact that it has been necessary for us to develop the resources of our own country. This is one step in that progress. If the experiment which the Government is now proposing by this bill will have the effect, as we believe that it will, of demonstrating that we have in this country the materials for the much-needed dyes used in manufacturing, that alone will compensate for the little money herein authorized and for all the time and energy expended in the experiment. Then add to that the tons of first-class fuel which can be added, at low prices we hope, to the fuel supply of the country, and the benefit will be almost incalculable.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAMLIN. For a question; yes.

Mr. MANN. I see there is nothing in this bill that says anything about briquetting. Is it the intention or is there any authorization for the Bureau of Mines, if it conducts these experiments, to sell any of the products of the experiments?

Mr. HAMLIN. I think not. That will not be the prime purpose of the Bureau of Mines. They will not go into it for the primary purpose of selling the products.

Mr. MANN. What will they do with them?

Mr. HAMLIN. I was going to say, if this becomes a law, they will put in a plant, as I understand, in conjunction with one partially erected.

Mr. MANN. They have sent in an estimate for a plant but not in conjunction with any other.

Mr. NORTON. If the gentleman will allow me, I will say that it is the intention of the bureau to sell the briquettes that they manufacture.

Mr. HAMLIN. I was going to further answer the gentleman that in the conduct of these experiments, not for the purpose of selling anything to make money, but in conducting these experiments, they will make some briquettes and will likely sell the briquettes that they make. But it is not the purpose of the bill to have the Government manufacture briquettes for sale. The purpose is to demonstrate to the business interests of the country the practicability and the feasibility of private capital going into the business on a large commercial scale.

Mr. MANN. I understand that from the gentleman's statement, and I would not interrupt him until he had passed that point. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to sell or otherwise dispose of any property, plant, or machinery purchased or acquired under the provisions of the act as soon as the experiment and investigation have been concluded. Would not that apparently forbid them to sell any of these products?

Mr. HAMLIN. It is perhaps possible that section 2 ought to have gone further and provided for the sale of any products that they have on hand when they cease investigation.

Mr. DENISON. I will suggest that the Government has ample use for all briquettes that are manufactured.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I ask the gentleman from Arkansas if there will be only one speech in conclusion on that side?

Mr. WINGO. I do not know—

Mr. STAFFORD. It is customary to have the opposition close when only one speech is to be made on the other side.

Mr. WINGO. Is the gentleman addressing his remarks to me? I know what is customary, and if the gentleman had understood me he would understand the situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought the gentleman from Arkansas would be courteous enough to comply with the usual custom.

Mr. WINGO. I do not require any instructions from the gentleman from Milwaukee as to courtesy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRISP). Gentlemen are out of order.

Mr. WINGO. I call the gentleman to order, and want to say that I require no lesson in courtesy from the gentleman from Milwaukee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not appreciate the courteous remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, this bill is the launching of a Government plant into the manufacture of by-products of lignite, and there is no escape from that conclusion in reading the bill. It is not limited in its expenditure to \$100,000, but when once the bill is passed authorizations for unlimited amounts can be presented to the Appropriations Committee. No one need delude himself that they are going to conclude these investigations in a short time. That is not what the Bureau of Mines does. They want to have a plant established and go into the business of making the by-products of lignite. They wish to establish this plant somewhere and then come to Congress for increased appropriations. This is purely a Government-ownership proposition. I am not surprised that it emanated from North Dakota, and I am not surprised that North Dakota is launching into the project, because North Dakota has the reputation for that character of experiment and investigation. If North Dakota wants to do it, let it take the responsibility. The Congress of the United States ought not at the present time to undertake this character of work. It is purely a proposition of Government ownership. There is no limit to the amount of money that may be expended. It is true that only \$100,000 is appropriated, but, as the gentleman from Illinois has explained, there is no authority for the disposition of the products. There is authority to dispose of them after the investigation has been concluded. But when will the experiment be concluded? If the Bureau of Mines did not have the authority to investigate this subject, I would not rise in opposition to a laboratory investigation. This is something more. It is the first time in the history of the Government that a bureau has called upon the National Government to go into the manufacturing business. Where will the limit be to that character of governmental activity?

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. I notice in line 5 the bill provides for the investigations of coal and peat.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman had been here he would know that the bill now is limited to lignite, under the amendment of the committee. If we go into the investigation of lignite coal why not have the Government go into every character of mineral deposit and determine whether it is advisable to commercially manufacture its by-products? If you are in favor of Government ownership, if you are in favor of something that is chimerical, if you are in favor of something that has not been established successfully, this is a good way to show the abuses and waste that follow from Government ownership.

Again I wish to emphasize that this is no time to enter upon such an investigation. I have no doubt that the Bureau of Mines can expend the money, but at the end the plant will be junked and sold for a mere pittance, without any resulting gain to the industrial and commercial activity of the country.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I used to be one of those men who saw ghosts every time anything was presented to me that I did not know anything about. As a matter of fact, there is no Government ownership in this matter. By any far-fetched imagination there could not be; but, in anticipation of some such objection that might be offered by those who do not know anything about it, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] offered an amendment, which the committee accepted, which is section No. 2, that absolutely precludes any possibility of the Government going into business. This bill is simple in its terms. The wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein.

It is simply a bill to establish a plant that will demonstrate from a commercial standpoint the feasibility of developing and utilizing this great natural resource of the United States. There is not a bit of Government ownership in it. If we wanted to bring in a Government-ownership bill we would bring in a bill that would authorize the establishment of briquetting plants and other activities on the public domain, because there are millions of tons of this lignite in the public lands; but the committee which reported this is composed of men who are opposed to Government activities of this kind, except where it is absolutely necessary to conserve or develop our natural resources and build up the industrial and economic strength of the Nation, and for that reason we come in here and ask for a miserable pittance of \$100,000 to undertake to develop one of the great natural resources of the United States, so as to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the commercial interests of the country that it would be a feasible proposition for them to come in and do like the commercial interests of other countries have done, namely, utilize the great product that is worth so much to our country.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I regret I can not yield; I have only four minutes. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] undertakes to say and did say boldly that this is a selfish proposition by a few Members to get a few thousand dollars spent in Arkansas, Texas, and Dakota. If the gentleman had known anything about the bill, he would have known that there is not a ton of lignite in my district; he would have known that not a dollar of this will be expended in my district nor in the district of any member of the committee; and he would have known where it is to be expended. If the gentleman had information about the matter, he would know that I have large coal fields in my district, and that if I were as selfish and as narrow in voting on legislation of this kind as the gentleman indicates that he is, I would oppose this, because the selfish interests of my district might be against the development of this great natural resource. Develop the lignite of Texas and they will not use as much coal from my district. Develop the lignites of North Dakota and of the West and they will not use so much coal from the gentlemen's districts, members of the committee, as they might otherwise use; but the members of this committee had no idea of selfishness but were moved solely by a desire to develop this great resource and thereby increase the economic strength of the Nation. The members of the committee found this great natural product in this country, one-third of the coal, and found that not only would its development add to the fuel and power of the country but that there is a possibility of breaking the monopoly of Germany in dyestuffs by developing and utilizing the oil that is found in these deposits. One hundred thousand dollars?

Oh, yes; "in these piping times of peace," as the gentleman says, we ought not to expend money for such purposes. Yet the gentleman has time and again voted for bills that expended millions on Government activities not worth one-half as much to the economic strength of the Nation, and he will do so again. You spend millions to build railroads in Alaska and millions to take care of private contractors, millions for irrigation, millions for public buildings, millions in increasing salaries, millions for useless positions, but, forsooth, when a committee comes in here with no selfish interests to serve, with none of them having a selfish interest in that the money is to be expended in their districts, and asks you to spend \$100,000 to develop and utilize one-third of the coal deposits of the United States by putting the use of lignite on a paying commercial basis, like it is in other countries, the gentleman, with an assumed air of superiority, and as the self-appointed mentor of the House, raises the bugaboo of Government ownership. Such a contention is absurd, and readily appears so by even a cursory reading of the bill.

I have no interest in the bill other than the interest all have who have vision and intelligence sufficient to see the wisdom of developing the natural resources of the country. Of course, those who are lacking in constructive thought, and who limit their activities to objecting to everything not proposed by themselves, or does not give a direct benefit to their districts, can be expected to oppose measures of this kind. The committee believed this expenditure wise and that it would bring a great return to the country, and directed me to report it, which I have done. I repeat, I have no special interest in the bill, nor has my district, but I support it because I believe it is a wise piece of constructive legislation that will promote the public welfare. It will, I think, ultimately mean a saving of \$15,000,000 annually to the State of Texas alone, and many more millions to the other Western States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. All time has expired. The question is

on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas to suspend the rules and pass the bill as read with the committee amendments.

The question was taken, and on a division, at the suggestion of the Chair, there were—ayes 38, noes 20.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, on this I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 182, nays 85, answered "present" 4, not voting 160, as follows:

YEAS—182.

Alexander	Egan	Jones	Ramseyer
Anderson	Eagle	Kehoe	Randall
Baer	Edmonds	Kelly, Pa.	Rankin
Barkley	Elston	King	Rayburn
Barnhart	Esch	Kinkaid	Romjue
Beakes	Evans	Knutson	Rubey
Bell	Fess	La Follette	Rucker
Benson	Fields	La Guardia	Sanders, La.
Beublin	Fisher	Lampert	Schall
Bland, Va.	Flood	Larsen	Scott, Mich.
Blanton	Focht	Lea, Cal.	Shallenberger
Booher	Fordney	Leshner	Siegel
Brodbeck	Foss	Linthicum	Sims
Buchanan	Foster	Little	Sinnott
Burnett	French	Littlepage	Sloan
Byrnes, S. C.	Gallagher	Lobeck	Small
Byrnes, Tenn.	Gandy	Loneragan	Smith, Idaho
Caldwell	Gard	Lundeen	Smith, T. F.
Candler, Miss.	Garner	McAndrews	Steagall
Cantrill	Garrett, Tenn.	McCulloch	Steenerson
Carlin	Glynn	McKinley	Stephens, Miss.
Cary	Goodwin, N. C.	Magee	Stephens, Nebr.
Cleary	Good	Mann	Stevenson
Coady	Goodwin, Ark.	Mansfield	Sumners
Collier	Gordon	Mapes	Taylor, Ark.
Connally, Tex.	Gray, Ala.	Martin	Taylor, Colo.
Copley	Griest	Mason	Tillman
Crago	Hadley	Mays	Timberlake
Cramton	Hamlin	Miller, Wash.	Voigt
Crisp	Hardy	Mondell	Walton
Crosser	Harrison, Va.	Morgan	Watson, Va.
Curry, Cal.	Hastings	Nelson, A. P.	Weaver
Darrow	Hawley	Nolan	Welling
Davis	Hayden	Norton	Welty
Dempsey	Heflin	Oldfield	Whaley
Denison	Hensley	Oliver, Ala.	Wheeler
Dent	Hilliard	Olney	White, Ohio
Denton	Holland	Osborne	Williams
Dickinson	Houston	Overstreet	Wilson, La.
Dill	Huddleston	Phelan	Wilson, Tex.
Dillon	Hull, Iowa	Platt	Wingo
Dixon	Hull, Tenn.	Polk	Wise
Dominick	Humphreys	Porter	Wright
Doollittle	Igoe	Pou	Young, Tex.
Dorcemus	Jacoway	Rainey, J. W.	
Doughton	James	Raker	

NAYS—85.

Almon	Fuller, Ill.	McKenzie	Snell
Anthony	Gillett	McKeown	Snook
Aswell	Gould	Merritt	Snyder
Ayres	Graham, Ill.	Montague	Stafford
Bacharach	Green, Iowa	Moon	Strong
Bankhead	Greene, Mass.	Moore, Pa.	Sweet
Birch	Greene, Vt.	Moore, Ind.	Temple
Blackmon	Hamilton, Mich.	Mott	Thompson
Bland, Ind.	Haskell	Paige	Tilson
Burroughs	Herzey	Parker, N. J.	Treadway
Campbell, Kans.	Hicks	Peters	Vare
Cannon	Hollingsworth	Powers	Vestal
Clark, Pa.	Johnson, Wash.	Purnell	Ward
Classon	Juul	Ramsey	Wason
Dale	Kearns	Rogers	Watson, Pa.
Dallinger	Kennedy, Iowa	Rose	White, Me.
Dies	Kincheloe	Rouse	Winslow
Dowell	Kraus	Rowe	Woodyard
Drukker	Langley	Sanders, Ind.	Zihlman
Elliot	London	Sanford	
Ellsworth	Lufkin	Sells	
Farr	McFadden	Shouse	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Browning	Chandler, Okla.	Claypool	Walsh
----------	-----------------	----------	-------

NOT VOTING—160.

Ashbrook	Cooper, W. Va.	Fairfield	Heaton
Austin	Cooper, Wis.	Ferris	Heintz
Black	Costello	Flynn	Helm
Borland	Cox	Francis	Helvering
Bowers	Currie, Mich.	Frear	Hood
Brand	Davey	Freeman	Howard
Britten	Decker	Fuller, Mass.	Husted
Browne	Delaney	Gallivan	Hutchinson
Brumbaugh	Dewalt	Garland	Ireland
Butler	Donovan	Garrett, Tex.	Johnson, Ky.
Campbell, Pa.	Doolling	Goodall	Johnson, S. Dak.
Caraway	Drane	Graham, Pa.	Kahn
Carew	Dunn	Gray, N. J.	Keating
Carter, Mass.	Dupré	Gregg	Kelley, Mich.
Carter, Okla.	Dyer	Griffin	Kennedy, R. I.
Chandler, N. Y.	Emerson	Hamill	Kettner
Church	Essen	Hamilton, N. Y.	Key, Ohio
Clark, Fla.	Estopinal	Harrison, Miss.	Kless, Pa.
Connelly, Kans.	Fairchild, B. L.	Haugen	Kitchin
Cooper, Ohio	Fairchild, G. W.	Hayes	Kreider

Lazaro	Nichols, Mich.	Russell	Sullivan
Lee, Ga.	Oliver, N. Y.	Sabath	Swift
Lehlbach	O'Shaunessy	Sanders, N. Y.	Switzer
Lever	Overmyer	Saunders, Va.	Tague
Longworth	Padgett	Scott, Iowa	Templeton
Lunn	Park	Scott, Pa.	Thomas
McArthur	Parker, N. Y.	Scully	Tinkham
McClintie	Pratt	Sears	Towner
McCormick	Price	Shackleford	Van Dyke
McLaughlin, Mich.	Quin	Sherley	Venable
McLaughlin, Pa.	Ragsdale	Sherwood	Vinson
McLemore	Rainey, H. T.	Sisson	Volstead
Madden	Reavis	Slayden	Waldow
Maher	Reed	Slomp	Walker
Miller, Minn.	Riordan	Smith, Mich.	Watkins
Morin	Robbins	Smith, C. E.	Webb
Mudd	Roberts	Stedman	Wilson, Ill.
Neely	Robinson	Steele	Wood, Ind.
Nelson, J. M.	Rodenberg	Sterling	Woods, Iowa
Nicholls S. C.	Rowland	Stiness	Young, N. Dak.

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. BROWNE.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.

Mr. HARRISON with Mr. REAVIS.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia with Mr. WALSH.

Mr. PADGETT with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. WATKINS with Mr. REED.

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. STEELE with Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. DUPRE with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.

Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. ROBINSON with Mr. SANDERS of New York.

Mr. SEARS with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. THOMAS with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. TOWNER.

Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be recorded present.

I have a pair with my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. PADGETT. If I were allowed to vote, I should vote "no."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SAUNDERS. I voted "aye." I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. WALSH was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is present, the Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record the tribute of ex-President Taft to the late Col. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is advised that has already been done to-day. The present occupant of the chair was not here then, but the clerks at the desk advise him that that order has been granted. This is suspension day, and the Speaker directed after the last motion that the Unanimous Consent Calendar be called.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The rule provides that immediately after the reading of the Journal on days when it is in order to suspend the rules the Speaker is directed to have the Unanimous Consent Calendar called. Business having intervened since the reading of the Journal, is it now in order to call the Unanimous Consent Calendar? Does it require unanimous consent to consider that calendar? I direct the present occupant of the chair to the rule:

On days when it shall be in order to move to suspend the rules the Speaker shall, immediately after the approval of the Journal, direct the Clerk to call the bills which have been for three days upon the Calendar for Unanimous Consent. Should objection be made to the consideration of any bill so called, it shall immediately be stricken from such calendar; but such bill may be restored to the calendar at the instance of the Member, and if again objected to it shall be immediately stricken from such calendar and shall not thereafter be placed thereon: *Provided*, That the same bill shall not be called twice on the same legislative day.

It has been the policy, as the present occupant of the chair well knows, that the Unanimous Consent Calendar has been first called, and then the Speaker would recognize certain Members

to move to suspend the rules. The rule specifically provides that immediately after the reading of the Journal it shall be in order and the Speaker is directed to have the Unanimous Consent Calendar called. Of course he has authority to suspend the rules and recognize Members for that purpose. Now, having done so, is it not too late to call the Unanimous Consent Calendar?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is suspension day. Under the rules the first and third Mondays of each month are suspension days, when it is in order to move a suspension of the rules, and by the unanimous-consent agreement it is Monday, as far as the order of business is concerned. A motion to suspend the rules is in order at any time on those two Mondays of the month—at any time a motion to suspend the rules is in order. Now, the rule provides that on suspension days the Unanimous Consent Calendar shall be called. It says:

Shall, immediately after the approval of the Journal, direct the Clerk to call the bills, etc.

No one will contend that that would prevent the Speaker recognizing some one to ask unanimous consent, as was done this morning, nor is it within the power of the Speaker to abrogate the rule by recognizing some one after the reading of the Journal to ask unanimous consent to do something else, and then say that because he has recognized some one to ask unanimous consent he can not physically direct the Clerk to call the Unanimous Consent Calendar after the reading of the Journal because he has done something else. The Speaker can not suspend a rule of the House in that way. It is the duty of the Speaker to have the Unanimous Consent Calendar called to-day under the rule. It is the privilege of the Speaker to recognize some one to ask unanimous consent to do something, and it is within the power of the Speaker to recognize any Member of the House to-day to move to suspend the rules, but meanwhile, when those things are out of the way, then the Unanimous Consent Calendar automatically is called for under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRISP). Answering the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], the Chair will state that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] correctly answered the inquiry. The Chair was going to answer the gentleman's inquiry before the gentleman from Illinois indicated his desire to express his views to the effect that this being the first Monday it was in order to call the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and the fact that there had been some motions to suspend the rules entertained previously in no wise vitiated the right that the Unanimous Consent Calendar should be called if the House should remain in session. The Clerk will report the first bill.

RESTORATION TO ENTRY OF 80-ROD STRIP RESERVATIONS IN ALASKA.

The first bill in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12210) to amend the act of May 14, 1898, as amended by the act of March 3, 1903, entitled "An act to extend the homestead laws and to regulate the sale and entry of public lands along the shore of navigable waters in Alaska."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman who reported this bill has to-day been ceremoniously deprived of his seat. I do not know whether the present Delegate from Alaska is acquainted with the present measure and I ask unanimous consent that the bill—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill is so plainly a proper measure and is so much needed by a few people that it ought not to be delayed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the last line of the bill there is a reservation that these reserved spaces shall not apply so far as harborage uses are concerned. I would like to inquire if that should not also include wharfage as well as harborage?

Mr. MANN. I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Do you want to pass it without prejudice?

Mr. MANN. It ought to pass the House. The legislation ought to be enacted. Under the law relating to Alaska when a man has taken a homestead claim there must be 80 rods intervening between two homesteads, which is entirely unnecessary, and makes them a long way apart. Then they are restricted as to the area in width, and so forth, when the fact is that these homesteaders who take homesteads for agricultural purposes have to run along a stream to a very large extent. They want length and not width. Now, strange to say, contrary to the belief which I have entertained for many years, they are really developing some agriculture up there. I have learned recently by some reports and from talks, partly with Mr. SULZER, that

they are supplying most of the small agricultural products up there by raising them at home. And this bill will permit these people to obtain homesteads which otherwise will be absolutely impossible and impracticable owing to the nature and location of the land up there suitable for the purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. The only doubt I had in my mind was as to whether it was feasible to grant to any homesteader more than 160 rods along any navigable stream.

Mr. MANN. But that is the very thing. Now, we reserved rights up there so as to reserve the navigation. But here comes a man wanting to homestead along a stream. He can only get now 160 rods. He can not go very far away from the stream—a narrow valley. He can utilize that ground in raising products. He can not afford to devote his entire time in raising products on a strip 160 rods long and which is only a few rods wide. There is no reason why he should not be permitted to get sufficient arable land in length to make him a homestead and then let somebody else get the land that is next to him. In other words, it was a desire on the part of Congress in the first place, and it was a proper desire, to prevent the monopolization of the lands along all navigable streams. In the main, that has been done, practically, and the Government has selected nearly everything they wanted up there, especially along the shore lines. We did not desire, and the gentleman will remember there were a number of contests in the House, to make it possible for some great monopoly to take the homesteads along the shore line and acquire the harborage rights on the harbors of Alaska. I think that is fully protected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12210) to amend the act of May 14, 1898, as amended by the act of March 3, 1903, entitled "An act to extend the homestead laws and to regulate the sale and entry of public lands along the shore of navigable waters in Alaska."

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stats. L., p. 409), extending the homestead laws to Alaska, and of the act of March 3, 1903 (32 Stats. L., p. 1028), amendatory thereof, in so far as they reserve from sale and entry a space of at least 80 rods in width between tracts sold or entered under the provisions thereof along the shore of any navigable water, and to provide that no entry shall be allowed extending more than 160 rods along the shore of any navigable water, shall not apply to lands classified and listed by the Secretary of Agriculture for entry under the act of June 11, 1906 (34 Stats., p. 233), and that the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, restore to entry and disposition such reserved spaces as he shall determine are not necessary for harborage uses and purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RAKER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

GRANT OF LANDS TO THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10587) granting to the city of San Diego certain lands in the Cleveland National Forest and the Capitan Grande Indian Reservation for dam and reservoir purposes for the conservation of water, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill, I understand, is not wanted to be considered now and ought to go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. RAKER. It will not take but a moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes; it will.

Mr. RAKER. We do not want to put it at the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed to the foot of the calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 6421) to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs or who have been totally disabled in the military or naval service of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Let the bill be considered, Mr. Speaker, on the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6421) to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in the same in the military or naval service of the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act all persons on the pension roll, and all persons hereafter granted a pension, who, while in the military or naval service of the United States, and in the line of duty, shall have lost one hand or one foot, or have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of \$65 per month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost an arm at or above the elbow, or a leg at or above the knee, or have been totally disabled in the same, or where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones of the arm or leg, or of the elbow or knee joints, or where there is an ankylosis of either of said joints, shall receive a pension at the rate of \$70 per month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost an arm at the shoulder, or a leg at the hip joint, or so near the shoulder or hip joint, or where the same is in such a condition as to prevent the use of an artificial limb, or have been totally disabled in the same, or where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the humerus or femur or of the shoulder or hip joint, or where there is ankylosis of either of said joints shall receive a pension at the rate of \$75 per month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost one hand and one foot, or have been totally disabled in the same, or where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the arm or leg, or where there is an ankylosis of any of the joints of said arm or leg, shall receive a pension at the rate of \$100 per month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost both hands or both feet, or have been totally disabled in the same, or where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones or joints of either of said arms or legs, or where there is an ankylosis of any of the joints of said arms or legs, shall receive a pension at the rate of \$100 per month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost both arms and both legs, or have been totally disabled in the same, or where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones or of the joints of either of said arms or legs, shall receive a pension at the rate of \$150 per month: *Provided, however*, That this act shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just read?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill will be stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on that bill. I want to make an explanation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

INCREASING PENSIONS OF ARMY NURSES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 7738) to increase the rate of pension allowed to Army nurses.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under a reservation of an objection, I ask that this bill be read for information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the rate of pension allowed to Army nurses of the Civil War, whose names have been or shall hereafter be properly placed upon the pension roll under the provisions of existing laws, and otherwise entitled to receive a less rate than herein provided, shall be \$25 per month.

Sec. 2. That this act shall not be construed to repeal or modify the provisions of section 4720, Revised Statutes, United States, as to rates of pension fixed by special act of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just read?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire of the gentleman who introduced the bill and reported it as to the number of nurses that this bill will apply to.

Mr. LANGLEY. My information, obtained from the Commissioner of Pensions or the Pension Office, is that there are now only about 145 Army nurses to whom this increase would apply. There were when this bill was introduced something over 200. Nearly all of these Army nurses have battle-field records. A majority of them, I am informed, are in indigent circumstances, and I really think that it was an oversight that they were not included in the Ashbrook bill and the Smoot bill, increasing the pensions of widows. Everybody, I think, will agree that these Army nurses with this record should have been included.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. I will.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman advise the House what these Army nurses now get?

Mr. LANGLEY. They get \$12 now. This bill is to increase their pension to \$25 per month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the Speaker recognize me at this moment to make a motion to suspend the rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that he is now temporarily occupying the chair, and, carrying out the instructions of the Speaker, he could not entertain a motion now by anybody to suspend the rules. The Clerk will report the next bill.

LANDS OF THE SOUTHERN OREGON CO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 8625) to accept from the Southern Oregon Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, a reconveyance of the lands granted to the State of Oregon by the act approved March 3, 1869, entitled "An act granting lands to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State," commonly known as the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant, to provide for the disposition of said lands, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the execution and delivery by the Southern Oregon Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, of a deed satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States, reconveying to the United States all the right, title, and interests of the said Southern Oregon Co. in and to the lands situated in the counties of Coos and Douglas, in the State of Oregon, and embraced within the limits of the grant made by the United States to the State of Oregon by the act of March 3, 1869, entitled "An act granting lands to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State," commonly known as the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant, and now involved in litigation pending in the Supreme Court of the United States under the style and title "The Southern Oregon Co. v. The United States," the said lands shall again become a part of the public domain, and the United States shall pay to the Southern Oregon Co. the sum of \$232,463.07. The execution and delivery of the aforesaid deed within 30 days from and after the approval of this act shall constitute the acceptance of this act by the said Southern Oregon Co.; and upon the approval of such deed by the Attorney General of the United States the aforesaid suit shall be dismissed and all matters of difference, controversy, and litigation between the United States and the said Southern Oregon Co. arising out of said land grant shall be deemed fully settled, adjusted, and terminated.

Sec. 2. That the taxes accrued and unpaid on the said lands on the date of the delivery of the deed provided for in the preceding section shall be paid by the Treasurer of the United States upon the order of the Secretary of the Interior as soon as may be after this act becomes effective, and a sum sufficient to make such payment and also to provide for the payment of the said sum of \$232,463.07, as provided for in section 1 of this act, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Sec. 3. That the said lands shall be classified and disposed of in the manner provided by the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. L., 218), for the classification and disposition of the Oregon and California railroad grant lands: *Provided*, That such persons who, being citizens of the United States, have continuously leased from the said Southern Oregon Co. for a period of not less than 10 years any of said lands classified as agricultural, not exceeding 160 acres to each person, shall be allowed a preference right of six months in which to purchase such lands from the United States by paying therefor the sum of \$2.50 per acre: *Provided further*, That where any of such leased lands have been resided upon, to the same extent and in the same manner as is required under the homestead laws, since the 1st day of December, 1913, by any person duly qualified to enter such lands claiming adversely to such lessee, and who has improved the land and devoted some portion thereof to agricultural use, and who shall have maintained his residence to the date of his application, the claim of such settler and resident shall be superior to that of the lessee, and he shall be allowed the preference right of entry afforded actual settlers by section 5 of the act of June 9, 1916, aforesaid.

Sec. 4. That the title to all money arising out of said lands and now on deposit to await the final outcome of said suit now pending in the Supreme Court, as aforesaid, is hereby vested in the United States, and the United States is subrogated to all the rights and remedies of the obligee or obligees, and especially of Harry E. Laughlin as commissioner, under any contract for the purchase of timber on said lands.

Sec. 5. That all moneys received from or on account of said lands and timber and the timber thereon under the provisions of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a separate fund to be designated "The Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund," which fund shall be disposed of in the following manner: A separate account shall be kept in the General Land Office of the sales of said lands and timber within each of the two counties of Coos and Douglas, and after the proceeds from such sales amount to a sum equal to that applied to pay the accrued taxes in that county and a sum equal to \$2.50 per acre for each acre of such land therein title to which is reverted in the United States pursuant to the provisions of this act, 25 per cent of all other moneys received from said lands shall be paid to the State treasurer of the State of Oregon, to be and become a part of the irreducible school fund of the State; 25 per cent shall be paid to the treasurer of the county in which the lands sold are situated for common schools, roads, highways, bridges, and port districts, to be apportioned by the county courts for the several purposes above mentioned; 40 per cent shall be paid into, reserved, and appropriated as a part of the fund created by the act of June 17, 1902, known as the reclamation act; and the remainder shall become a part of the general fund in the Treasury of the United States. The payments herein authorized shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States upon the order of the Secretary of the Interior, as the fund accumulates in the Treasury: *Provided*, That none of the payments to the State and counties and to the reclamation fund provided for in this section shall be made until the Treasury has been reimbursed in the amount paid to the Southern Oregon Co. and also for all taxes paid pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect; and any person, applicant, purchaser, entryman, or witness who shall swear falsely in any affidavit or proceeding required hereunder or under the regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior shall be guilty of perjury and liable to the penalties prescribed therefor.

SEC. 7. That the sum of \$50,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to enable the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, or otherwise, to complete the classification of the lands as herein provided, which amount shall be immediately available and shall remain available until such classification shall have been completed.

SEC. 8. That this act shall become effective upon its acceptance by the Southern Oregon Co., in the manner provided by the first section hereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just read?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. SINNOTT. If this bill is deferred in its passage until February or March, an additional amount of taxes will accrue to the extent of \$40,000 or \$60,000. This matter has been in the courts for some time. The Attorney General's Office has effected a compromise with the wagon-road company, by which the wagon-road company offers to settle the litigation, receiving just exactly what the courts have held that the wagon-road company is entitled to, and no more. If this bill is further delayed until the next tax-paying time comes around, something like \$40,000 or \$60,000 more of taxes will have to be paid in March, and it is to the interest of the Government that this litigation be settled at once. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] will not insist on his objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, may the bill be again reported?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will again be read.

The bill was again read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SINNOTT. I wish to further state, Mr. Speaker, that this is really a bill retaking something like 93,000 acres of land and vesting in the United States Government the title of a wagon-road grant. The bill was drafted by the Attorney General's office and introduced by myself, and the committee modified the bill and changed the allowance to the State from 50 per cent to 25 per cent.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The copy of the bill that I have before me does not show that it has been reported from the committee.

Mr. SINNOTT. It has been reported from the Committee on Public Lands. The gentleman must have the wrong copy.

Mr. MANN. It was reported on June 24, 1918, by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Just a moment, if you please. Is there a unanimous report?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes. There is a unanimous report.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, just prior to the close of the last session I asked unanimous consent that this bill be passed over so that further information could be obtained, and later on my former colleague, Senator LENROOT, called upon me and stated that he had given very full consideration to this measure and that it was in line with the bill that had been passed concerning the Oregon and California railroad land grants.

Mr. SINNOTT. Except the allowance to the State is cut in two.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The bill ought to be on the Union Calendar.

Mr. SINNOTT. It is.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the gentleman from Tennessee I might say that I was a member of the subcommittee, consisting of Mr. TILLMAN as chairman and somebody else, and that we reported this bill unanimously to the whole committee. The report was unanimous from the Committee on the Public Lands in favor of this bill.

It occurred to the committee from the evidence that the matter was urgent, and that the Government stood to gain in the transaction; that 93,000 acres of good timber land—most of it good timber land—was granted back to the Government, and altogether the United States was to be the gainer in the passage of the bill. I think, therefore, that there should not be any objection made.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that the bill is on the Union Calendar. While my friend says it was on the House Calendar, it is now on the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I withdraw the objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was again read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 25, after the word "terminated" add the following: "Provided, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the United States from instituting and maintaining such suits or actions as may be necessary to recover the value of timber or other material heretofore cut or removed from any of said lands without the consent of the Southern Oregon Co."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 6, after the word "accrued" strike out the word "and," and after the word "unpaid" insert the words "and now delinquent."

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a clerical mistake. In line 6 the insertion of the word "now" in the amendment is improper, because it obscures the sense and is really not good grammar. On page 3, line 6, the word "now" should be stricken out of the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman offers to amend the committee amendment by striking out the word "now"?

Mr. SINNOTT. By striking out the word "now."

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINNOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Attorney General, in his letter to the chairman of the committee, suggested that it should be made clear whether the Government is to pay only the principal of the taxes or both the principal and the penalties and interest. As I read this amendment, the Government will be obligated to pay the penalties and the interest.

Mr. SINNOTT. That is the way they did upon the Oregon-California railroad grant. The taxes, including penalties and interest, are a valid lien, and I think they should be paid.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, we are helping the county by paying this large sum, running into \$400,000.

Mr. SINNOTT. Well, at the same time you are removing the property from the tax roll.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the amount of the penalties and interest accumulated on the taxes now due on this property?

Mr. SINNOTT. It is stated in the report of the Attorney General, on page 5, that the taxes in Coos County, without penalty and interest, for the years 1909 to 1916 amount to \$233,636.45, while with the penalty and interest these taxes amount to \$366,693.95. The net tax claimed by Douglas County, where the smaller portion of the grant is situated, amounts to \$32,463.55, while the penalty and interest in this county are \$9,699.11, making a total for Douglas County of \$42,162.66.

Mr. STAFFORD. Making a total altogether of \$408,846.61?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And making a grand total of \$641,309.68?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes. That will require a total payment, of the taxes and the amount to the wagon-road company, aggregating \$641,309.68, while the minimum valuation put upon the revested land is \$2,000,000, and the estimates run from \$2,000,000 up to \$4,000,000. The Government will get 75 per cent of that difference. The taxes are ultimately going to be paid out of the sale of the land and timber.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I read the report, the \$641,309.68 is the total amount for taxes, penalties, and interest.

Mr. SINNOTT. The total cost to the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. For taxes alone?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; for taxes and the payment of \$2.50 an acre to the wagon-road company.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is not the way I read that paragraph. Let us read it again:

It will thus be seen that if Congress assumes the obligation of paying all the accrued taxes, with penalty and interest, the total cost to the Government will amount to \$641,309.68.

Mr. SINNOTT. If you add together the \$232,463.07 and the \$408,846.61, it amounts to \$641,309.68.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is correct and I am in error.

Mr. SINNOTT. That is the total payment.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is there any question in the gentleman's mind that the term "taxes unpaid and delinquent" includes penalties and interest?

Mr. SINNOTT. There is some question.

Mr. MANN. I should think so.

Mr. SINNOTT. And in the Oregon land-grant case the Attorney's General's office finally resolved it in favor of paying the penalties and the interest, and I tried to impress upon the committee the importance of clearing that up, but the committee thought otherwise. I wanted to insert the phrase "including penalties and interest," although I think that the Attorney General's office will probably advise the payment of the penalties and the interest. I think, as the gentleman from Illinois does, that the matter should be cleared up now, but I do not feel at liberty to offer the amendment.

Mr. MANN. It is also important in connection with section 5, where it provides for the repayment, that—

after the proceeds from such sales amount to a sum equal to that applied to pay the accrued taxes in that county and a sum equal to \$2.50 per acre for each acre of such land therein title to which is revested in the United States pursuant to the provisions of this act—

certain disposition shall be made of the money. I take it, however, that that is sure to mean whatever taxes are paid.

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Whether it includes penalties and interest or not?

Mr. SINNOTT. I think the bill should be amended to insert the phrase "including penalties and interest," but I do not feel at liberty to offer the amendment.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt that before it becomes a law it will be so amended.

Mr. GARD. I ask the gentleman to yield for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman of the committee. Will the chairman of the committee advise me whether or not it was the intention of the committee to include this matter of penalties and interest?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is my recollection, that it was.

Mr. SINNOTT. I think the committee thought that language included it, but I wanted to make it clear.

Mr. GARD. Another member of the committee advises me that such is not the fact.

Mr. MANN. Are not the penalties and interest a lien on the land, and do they not have to be paid?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The Government has no right to assume to seize this land without paying the taxes that are due upon it, has it? I do not know.

Mr. GARD. I do not know. The matter is one of arrangement between the Government and this corporation as to what shall be paid by the Government.

Mr. MANN. There is a contest between the parties, but the title is in the corporation.

Mr. GARD. The title is in the corporation.

Mr. MANN. And the taxes are assessed against the land.

Mr. GARD. In the transfer of the title there may be a provision as to the amount of taxes to be paid.

Mr. MANN. Here is a case where the taxes are assessed by a municipality. The Government makes an arrangement in the contest by which the Government takes the title back from the private corporation. Meanwhile the taxes have accrued. I doubt very much whether the Government, in compromising with that party, can oust the municipality or county of its right of taxation against this land. Very likely the money has been spent, and it may be bills issued to be paid out of the receipts when collected on this property. I do not know how that is.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer an amendment to clear that matter up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee amendments will be first disposed of and then the Chair will recognize the gentleman to offer an amendment. The Clerk will first report the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 6, strike out the word "now," at the end of the line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the committee amendment as amended.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 24, after the word "years," insert "or who under lease from said company have cultivated and placed valuable improvements upon."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman if this is intended to include persons who may have put on inexpensive improvements and give them a preferential right to the property at \$2.50 an acre?

Mr. SINNOTT. That committee amendment was put in at the suggestion of the Attorney General's office. The gentleman who went out there to investigate the land and the grant reports upon page 16 what he found upon the ground. A great many settlers went upon this land thinking they could compel the Wagon Road Co. to execute a deed to them, for the reason that the granting act contained the language that the grant should be "upon condition that the lands shall be sold to any person only in quantities not greater than a one-quarter section and for a price not exceeding \$2.50 an acre."

Parties went on the land, cultivated it, and plowed and improved it. The court held that no settler could compel the Wagon Road Co. to make a grant to him. So the settlers, in order to protect their rights, entered into leases and agreements with the Wagon Road Co. that they should occupy the land, and in some cases also took options of sale. That committee amendment is for the purpose of taking care of these settlers and those who placed improvements thereupon.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill as reported takes care of those who have continuously leased from the Wagon Road Co. for not less than 10 years. This will provide for subsequent squatters who happen to go on the land and make improvements.

Mr. SINNOTT. Who leased from the Wagon Road Co. and have cultivated the land and placed improvements thereon. In addition to paying \$2.50 an acre these parties mentioned in the committee amendment would have to pay the taxes accrued against the land. They have that additional burden added to that of the ordinary purchaser.

Mr. MANN. Do they have to pay for the timber?

Mr. SINNOTT. They could not get the timber. If the timber runs over a million two hundred thousand to 160 acres, the land will be classified the same as it is under the Oregon and California land grants.

Mr. MANN. Is there any necessity of having both these provisions in the bill—the one in the bill and now the committee amendment. Are there any of these lessees who have continually leased the land for 10 years who have not made any valuable improvement upon it?

Mr. SINNOTT. That was the information of the Attorney General's office.

Mr. MANN. The information of the Attorney General's office was that people who had leased the land for 10 years continuously and made valuable improvements ought to have priority, of right, but are there any of those who have leased continuously for 10 years and made no improvements on the land? I ask out of curiosity.

Mr. HAWLEY. I can not answer it from very specific knowledge, but I understand from information that there are persons who leased under 10-year provisions and who have built houses, barns, fenced the land, and cultivated and made their homes there and who have been paying taxes.

Mr. MANN. There is no occasion for the original provision remaining in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me ask the gentleman if this is intended to take care of those who are mentioned on page 16—mere squatters on the land, who entered into it without any arrangement with the Wagon Road Co.?

Mr. HAWLEY. No; the amendment provides that they must have a lease from the Wagon Road Co.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the lease may be made at any time, and it was the original intention to grant this right to those who had a lease for 10 years.

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Attorney General's office points out that there are a few persons who entered on the land without any contractual relations with the Wagon Road Co. and lived there a little while and made some scattering improvements.

Mr. SINNOTT. They are not embraced in this provision.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; they are if they subsequently got a lease.

Mr. SINNOTT. They must have had a lease and they must have had it for the last five or six years.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; they could get a lease after this bill passes.

Mr. SINNOTT. The court has enjoined the Wagon Road Co. from making any disposition of the land. That injunction has been in force, I think, since 1914 or 1915.

Mr. MANN. Does that prevent the making of a lease of the ground?

Mr. SINNOTT. Any disposition at all until Congress shall have had an opportunity to pass on it.

Mr. MANN. Are they forbidden to make a lease of the ground?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is sure of that?

Mr. SINNOTT. I am.

Mr. MANN. Unless they violate the injunction, there would be no leases granted after this bill passes.

Mr. SINNOTT. No.

Mr. HAWLEY. The lease would be invalid if granted?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I do not know that the lease would be invalid. They might send the man to jail for contempt of court.

Mr. HAWLEY. In answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin, my information is that the persons to be taken care of in the amendment of the committee have built good improvements on the land, intending to make it their home; they have built fences and barns and houses and other improvements.

Mr. STAFFORD. They went there without any arrangement with the Wagon Road Co.

Mr. HAWLEY. If any such people are included in this amendment, I do not know of them. I am speaking of those who have not resided on the land for 10 years, but who have resided there for 4 or 5 years and have made good improvements.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are pure squatters, and this is to take care of those people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the other committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 4, after the word "acre," insert the words "and reimbursing the United States for the taxes paid on such land: *Provided further.*"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, lines 15, 16, and 17, after the word "paid," in line 15, strike out the words "to the State treasurer of the State of Oregon, to be and become a part of the irreducible school fund of the State, 25 per cent shall be paid."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, lines 21, 22, 23, and 24, after the word "mentioned," in line 21, strike out the words "40 per cent shall be paid into, reserved, and appropriated as a part of the fund created by the act of June 17, 1902, known as the reclamation act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 6, after the word "the," strike out the words "State and," and after the word "counties," in line 6, strike out the words "and to the reclamation fund."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 20, strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$12,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SALARY OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY—CONNECTICUT.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 4246) to increase the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Connecticut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Connecticut shall be at the rate of \$5,000 a year.

The committee amendment was read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,500."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that this bill is one that has been pending in different shapes here for a number of years. I think the first report was to increase the salary from \$2,500 for the district attorney to \$3,500.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman may possibly be referring to the bill to increase the salary in Rhode Island.

Mr. MANN. Well, it may have been Rhode Island. I do not differentiate between the two—they are both alike; both equally meritorious. Next it was reported to increase the salary from \$2,500 to \$4,000. Now I see the bill is reported to increase the salary from \$2,500 to \$4,500. Does not the gentleman from Connecticut believe it would be a good idea for some one to object so the next Congress may put it to \$5,000; probably the district attorney for so important a district ought to get \$5,000 a year.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that in the Sixty-third Congress a bill passed the Senate fixing the salary at \$4,000, and the committee which had the matter in charge in the House decided not to deal with questions of this character because it was following the outbreak of the European war, when no such appropriation bills were being considered.

Mr. MANN. Oh, we have had a bill reported from that committee every Congress. I think, for a number of Congresses for this very Rhode Island, increasing the salary from \$2,500 to some amount, as I have stated before.

Mr. LONERGAN. Well, the Sixty-third Congress and this Congress are the only two I know of that considered a bill for Connecticut, and the committee has acted favorably on the pending bill. I will say to the gentleman that the district attorney in Connecticut is obliged to devote all of his time to the performance of the duties of his office. The Attorney General approves of an increase.

The United States district judge wrote a letter stating that the attorney was fully occupied in the performance of his duties and the population of the State of Connecticut has increased between 600,000 and 700,000 since the salary was fixed at \$2,500 something like 50 years ago. We have the largest alien population industrially in the United States.

Mr. MANN. What has that got to do with the district attorney?

Mr. LONERGAN. I was just leading up to it. The war work in the industries has been very great, and we did not have in the State of Connecticut any cases of property destruction or loss of life, because under the jurisdiction of the United States district attorney's office there was a large number of men employed doing detective work, investigation work, and reporting back to the United States district attorney. The office has been efficiently conducted, and I think if the gentleman from Illinois will make inquiry at the office of the Attorney General he will find that they have had as much of the watching of property as any office in the United States of like character.

Mr. MANN. I have not said anything against the district attorney. I doubt very much whether the district attorney has very much to do with watching over the natives or alien population during the war, and, if so, that is past in the main. There may be other reasons, but I rose mainly to suggest to my distinguished friend from Connecticut that this bill is for one district of the United States. It has to go through, if it passes here, and pass the scrutiny of another body of very distinguished people. I trust it will not be weighted down when it comes back with amendments fixing the salary in a lot of the other districts, because if it does it may pass here; I do not know.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LONERGAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ELDORADO, KANS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12881) to increase the cost of the public building at Eldorado, Kans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill just reported? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12881) to increase the cost of the public building at Eldorado, Kans.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913, authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to contract for the acquisition, by purchase or otherwise, of a site and to contract for the erection and completion thereon of a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, complete, for the use and accommodation of the United States post office and other Government offices at Eldorado, Kans., be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to increase the limit of cost for said building from \$60,000 to \$95,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. AYRES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

UNLAWFUL ORGANIZATIONS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4471) to declare unlawful associations purposing by physical force, violence, or injury to bring about any governmental, social, industrial, or economic change in the United States, and prescribing punishment for persons engaged in the activities of such associations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR DISTRICT OF ARIZONA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 714) providing for an additional judge for the district of Arizona.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Indiana object, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

TIMBER PRIVILEGES TO CERTAIN CITIZENS IN OREGON.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12579) to grant citizens of Malheur County, Ore., the right to cut timber in the State of Idaho for agricultural, mining, or other domestic purposes, and to remove such timber to Malheur County, Ore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just read?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let us have the bill reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of an act entitled "An act to repeal the timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following:

"That it shall be lawful for the Secretary of the Interior to grant permits, under the provisions of the eighth section of the act of March 3, 1891, to citizens of Malheur County, Ore., to cut timber in the State of Idaho for agricultural, mining, or other domestic purposes, and to remove the timber so cut to Malheur County, State of Oregon."

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "ninety-one," insert the following: "chapter 561, as amended by an act approved March 3, 1891, chapter 559, page 1093, volume 26, United States Statutes at Large."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill just read?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman who has introduced the bill to inform the House of the necessity for a bill which grants the cutting of

timber in one State to be carried to another State without any apparent limitation as to its use.

Mr. SINNOTT. The present law and regulations permit the cutting of timber not to exceed the value of \$50 in any one year, to be used for the purposes set forth in the act, but that law precludes the use of that timber so cut in any other State than the State in which it is cut, except that the act has been twice amended permitting timber to be taken from Wyoming to Idaho and from Montana to Wyoming. Now, in the section of Oregon seeking relief by this bill there is no timber; there is particularly no timber in the Jordan Valley, on the Oregon side. The Jordan Valley is half in Oregon, in Malheur County, and half in Idaho. Over on the Idaho side there is considerable juniper timber, which may be cut and used for fence posts and for other domestic purposes. Over on the Oregon side they have recently voted a bond issue of some \$900,000 to irrigate lands under a Carey Act project, and unless they can get this timber over on the Idaho side they are going to be very much handicapped and embarrassed in the development of this section of the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was again reported.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is perfectly natural that the gentleman who drafted the bill should draft it in the form that he did, but it makes a rather, I was going to say, ludicrous condition of the statutes, because this is a provision to add to the eighth section of a certain law an amendment which says the provision of the eighth section, and so forth, shall not apply. That is the section to which this amendment is added, so that when this law shall be compiled it will read as section so-and-so, and at the end of that section it will refer to itself in a very formal manner, by referring to itself as the eighth section of a certain statute of the United States as amended. It would have been simpler, I would suggest to the gentleman, to amend the section by adding the new language to the provision of this section, and so forth, because this becomes a part of section 8.

Mr. SINNOTT. I probably followed the precedents too slavishly. I merely copied the other old amendments.

Mr. MANN. I am not endeavoring to criticize the gentleman at all. What was done was very natural, but it does make it read rather awkwardly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman advise the House why he made the reference to the law he seeks to amend so specific, by not only citing it by chapter but also by the date on which it was passed? It is not customary to be so specific, to mention the chapter and then add the date of the approval of the act.

Mr. SINNOTT. I will say to the gentleman that there were two acts passed about the same time, and the date was included so as to distinguish between the two.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; but the two acts did not bear the same title. It says:

That section 8 of an act entitled "An act to repeal the timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, chapter 561, as amended by an act approved March 3, 1891, chapter 559, page 1093, volume 26, United States Statutes at Large.

I do not think the gentleman could find anything else in the statute whereby he could describe the act which he intends to amend more specifically.

Mr. SINNOTT. There has always been a matter of uncertainty—

Mr. MANN. No; it has not been a matter of uncertainty. It is a fact that the Land Office and the Department of the Interior have recommended this sort of thing for years, and I have almost reached the conclusion that it is a good thing.

If there is one difficult thing to find it is something in the Statutes at Large where you refer to the date of the statute and the date of the approval, because the dear compilers of the Statutes at Large will not print on each page of the Statutes at Large the date of the approval of the act, but they simply put in the chapter, and if you know the date of the approval of the act you can look and find it. In the case of appropriation bills you have to look at the end or the beginning in order to find the date. Now, these people have recommended an amendment which permits anyone at a moment's notice to turn to the page of the statute where the matter is to be found, and to know exactly how to find it, and where to find it, and find it quickly.

Mr. STAFFORD. The reference to the page is surplusage. Mr. MANN. It is all surplusage. I can find it by reference to the title.

Mr. STAFFORD. But it is not necessary to put it in.

Mr. MANN. I say it is not necessary to put any of it in, but I am getting around to the conclusion, that it is a good thing to put in the chapter and page, so as to find it quickly in the Statutes at Large. Our statutes of the United States are now so jumbled up that the famed "Philadelphia lawyer" can not find what he is hunting one time in two.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the passage of this bill or take up the time of the House more than a moment, but I want to congratulate the Committee on Public Lands on their energy and capacity for getting out their own bills. There are quite a number on this calendar from that committee, and they are making progress and passing bills. I hope they will soon have their bills all wound up, so that they can pay some attention to the bills of other Members who are not on the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman that from the commencement of this session of Congress in December the chairman of that committee [Mr. FERRIS] has been unavoidably away on account of sickness.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I suppose he was overworked in the handling of a national campaign. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; both he and his wife have been quite ill with the "flu." Politics has nothing to do with his absence. But he will not be here next week. I have been acting as chairman of the Public Lands Committee thus far this session and I have tried to give every man who has a bill pending before the committee an opportunity to come before the committee, and we have heard everybody who has come. You have not appeared before the committee this session. We have had several meetings and hearings have been given to everyone who asked recognition, I think. We have endeavored to finish up as nearly as we can all the important business and not at all confine our actions to bills in which the membership of the committee are interested. In fact, we put in practically all this morning listening to Senators and Senate bills. There has been no thought whatever of selfishly reporting out only our own bills. But it is perfectly natural that the members of that committee from the public-land States should have more of those bills than other Members do. However, any Member who has a bill that ought to pass can very easily get a hearing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I congratulate the gentleman. I have had a bill pending there for a long time, and I have been promised several times that I shall have a hearing.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Has the gentleman ever asked for a hearing?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; I have asked for a hearing many times.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If I am acting chairman, as I probably will be, I assure the gentleman he will be accorded a hearing if he appears before the committee next Saturday morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have asked for a hearing many times, as the chairman of the committee and the secretary will testify.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman, for his satisfaction, that the committee ordered favorably reported four of the gentleman's bills this morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am very glad to hear it; and on the strength of that statement I will withdraw my pro forma amendment. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE SENATOR BRADY, OF IDAHO.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Sunday, January 26, be set aside for addresses on the life, character, and services of the late Senator BRADY, of Idaho.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that Sunday, January 26, be set aside for addresses on the life, character, and services of the late Senator BRADY, of Idaho.

There was no objection.

WATER SUPPLY FOR OLATHE, COLO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 5989) to grant certain lands to the town of Olathe, Colo., for the protection of its water supply.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, these seem to be public-land bills. I will ask the gentleman if he intends to have the House adjourn as soon as this bill passes?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; I was hoping that we could let it run through this whole page. Here are nine public-land bills, all of which are meritorious measures.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois and to the House that the only way under the sun that the western Members of this House can ever get an opportunity to have these necessary bills passed is by their consideration on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not need to spend any time in telling me that. I know that.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. MANN. I did not take up the time of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I know the gentleman has not. He has been treating us very nicely.

Mr. MANN. It was the gentleman's side of the House that wasted time to-day.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; we have not wasted any time.

Mr. MANN. Why, surely.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not think either side has wasted any time.

Mr. MANN. First, you wasted time in two roll calls on a contested-election case. Then you wasted time on some other matters. The delay did not come from this side of the House. It does not lie in the mouth of any gentleman on that side of the House to lecture this side of the House about wasting time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I have not been lecturing anybody.

Mr. MANN. Especially in view of what has taken place since the first Monday in December.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the town of Olathe, county of Montrose, and State of Colorado, the southeast quarter of section 24, township 48 north, range 12, and the south half of section 19, and the southwest quarter of section 20, both in township 48 north, range 11 west, of the New Mexico principal meridian, in said county and State, containing 640 acres, more or less, to have and to hold said lands for the purpose of the protection of the reservoirs and water-supply pipe lines and water-works system of said town: *Provided*, That the said town of Olathe shall, within two years from the passage of this act, pay for said lands, or such portions thereof as may be necessary for said purposes, at the rate of \$1.25 per acre: *Provided further*, That the grant hereby made is, and the patent issued thereunder shall be, subject to all legal rights heretofore acquired by any person or persons in or to the above-described premises, or any part thereof, and now existing under and by virtue of the laws of the United States: *And provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, coal, and other mineral deposits that may be found in the lands so granted, and all necessary use of the lands for extracting the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "same" insert the following:

"*And provided further*, That title to the land shall revert to the United States should the same or any part thereof be sold or cease to be used for the purposes herein provided."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

TELEGRAPHS AND TELEPHONES.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a letter discussing the telegraph and telephone systems and the wisdom of the union of the two and the Government ownership of the same. This letter is written by Mr. Theodore N. Vail, president of one of these companies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record as indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that Mr. Vail is now associated with the Government in the operation and direction of the telephone and telegraph systems of the country.

Mr. MOON. I do not know whether he is or not.

Mr. STAFFORD. If he is not, I shall be constrained to object. I understand that he occupies some official capacity with the Government.

Mr. MOON. He may. I do not know whether he does or does not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, until I can get the information—

Mr. STEENERSON. I have seen the statement in the newspapers that he is the official adviser of the Postmaster General on telegraphs and telephones.

Mr. STAFFORD. If he occupies some official capacity with the Government, I have no objection to the matter being inserted in the Record. Otherwise, I shall object.

Mr. MOON. I do not know, but I accept the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COAL LANDS IN ALASKA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 35) to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands in Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire whether this bill extends to others than qualified homestead entrymen?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not think so. I have not the general law before me, but it is to allow agricultural entries on lands reserved for coal lands.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to direct the attention of the gentleman to the designation that it applies to "actual settlers." That does not mean qualified entrymen. It would apply to any person who happened to locate upon Government land.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not think there was any intentional point in that matter. It was to make the law extend to the Territory of Alaska. We have a law allowing agricultural entries on the surface of coal lands.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the purpose to grant them the privilege of entering upon unsurveyed public lands?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think so. My recollection is that there are great quantities of land in Alaska not surveyed and perhaps will not be for 50 years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do we authorize entries in the States on unsurveyed public lands?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes, forest reserves; and survey it out by metes and bounds.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR RECLAMATION OF LANDS IN OREGON.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13042) providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Let us have the bill read.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, within his discretion, to extend for a period of not exceeding 10 years the time of segregation in the Oregon Carey Act segregation list No. 13, comprising approximately 27,000 acres of land, same being situated in Deschutes County, Oreg., provided the Secretary of the Interior is further authorized to grant to the State of Oregon a similar extension of 10 years for the reclamation of said lands in addition to the time allotted under existing rules, regulations, contracts, and laws,

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, within his discretion, to continue to not beyond January 12, 1929, the segregation of the lands embraced in approved Oregon segregation list No. 13, under the Carey Act.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if it is customary to use in the law the expression "Carey Act"?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes; it is referred to in those words in various statutes. This amendment came from the department and was recommended by the department.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Carey Act has a well-defined meaning to our minds, but has it a well-defined meaning in the courts?

Mr. SINNOTT. I think it has a well-defined meaning in the courts. Everyone understands it as well as they do the "reclamation law."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is referred to in the courts as the Carey Act.

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was again read for amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO THE ESPIONAGE ACT.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 9094) to amend section 1 of Title VIII of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill, and it is too late to give it the consideration that it ought to have. I suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that it go over.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of no quorum. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order for me to move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not think that anything is in order after the fact is ascertained that no quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, the following leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. TAGUE, leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. BRAND, for five days, on account of illness.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. ZIHLMAN, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers, without leaving copies, in the case of John T. Wheeler, Company I, Seventeenth West Virginia Volunteers, Sixty-fifth Congress, no adverse report being made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 8, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation, with the recommendation that it be given favorable consideration for inclusion in the sundry civil appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 1644); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the health department of the District of Columbia for preventing the spread of contagious diseases, fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1645); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a paragraph of legislation extending during the fiscal year 1920 the appropriation and authorization made by the act of July 1, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1646); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a statement of the number of men in the service of the commission exempted from military duty or placed in deferred classification on request of the commission (H. Doc. No. 1647); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the secretary of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting a statement of employees of the United States Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation who have been exempted from military duty or given deferred classification (H. Doc. No. 1648); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a list showing the number of men in the service of the War Department at Washington for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification were asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1649); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting a statement showing all the employees of the Emergency Fleet Corporation who have been given deferred classification (H. Doc. No. 1650); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting lists of employees of the Department of Justice for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification were asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1651); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a list of employees of the Department of Labor for whom requests for deferred classification were asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1652); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of employees for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1653); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a list of employees of the Department of Commerce for whom exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1654); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting names of men in the active or reserve forces of the Military Establishment, commissioned or enlisted, who have been assigned to clerical work and placed in deferred classification by reason of such assignment (H. Doc. No. 1655); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement showing the number of employees of the Department of the Interior for whom exemption from military duty or deferred classification has been asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1656); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Secretary of State, the number of men in the service of the State Department for whom exemption from military duty or deferred classification has been asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1657); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting the number of men in the service of the Food Administrator, Fuel Administrator, and all boards and commissions appointed by Executive order since April 6, 1917, for whom exemption from military duty or deferred classification has been asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1658); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

16. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports from accounting officers of the Treasury Department, showing what officers of the Government were delinquent in rendering their accounts for the fiscal year ended June

30, 1918, with a list of such officers, who, upon final settlement of their accounts, were found indebted to the Government, and who at the date of the report had failed to pay the same into the Treasury of the United States (H. Doc. No. 1659); to the Committee on Expenditures in Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SHERLEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13708) providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 892), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DILLON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 5058) to authorize the counties of Morton and Burleigh, in the State of North Dakota, to construct a bridge across the Missouri River near Bismarck, N. Dak., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 893), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4966) to extend the time for the construction by the Gulf Ports Terminal Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Florida, of a bridge or bridges over and across the headwaters of Mobile Bay and such navigable channels as are between the east side of the bay and Blakeley Island, in Baldwin and Mobile Counties, Ala., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 894), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DEWALT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13446) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Sixteenth Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 895), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13427) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the borough of Wilson, in the county of Allegheny, Pa., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 896), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13429) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near McKees Rocks Borough, in the county of Allegheny, Pa., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 897), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12513) granting an increase of pension to Henry Robert; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12078) granting a pension to Hodges W. Drayton; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged; and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12839) granting a pension to Bronislawa Wypiewski; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12938) granting an increase of pension to Joe Loudermilk, jr.; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 13671) to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion, and to secure the

abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 13672) for the relief of soldiers who have not had service overseas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 13673) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Easton, Pa., four German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13674) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bethlehem, Pa., three German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 13675) to increase the compensation of pressmen in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BIRCH: A bill (H. R. 13676) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Boonton, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13677) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dover, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13678) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Madison, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13679) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Morristown, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13680) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elizabeth, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13681) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rahway, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13682) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Summit, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13683) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Plainfield, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13684) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Westfield, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 13685) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cape May, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13686) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wildwood, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13687) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ocean City, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13688) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Burlington, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13689) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mount Holly, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13690) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Moorestown, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13691) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bridgeton, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13692) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Millville, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13693) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Vineland, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13694) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pleasantville, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13695) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mays Landing, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13696) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hammonton, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13697) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Atlantic City, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13698) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cape May Court House, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KALANIANA'OLE: A bill (H. R. 13699) to authorize the governor of the Territory of Hawaii to acquire privately owned lands and rights of way within the boundaries of the Hawaii National Park; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 13700) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of Bonham, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 13701) to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for an arch to be erected in the city of Washington, D. C., to be known as the Arch of Victory, to commemorate the heroes and events of the great war; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 13702) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Gouverneur, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 13703) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Catasauqua, Pa., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13704) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Reading, Pa., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13705) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Allentown, Pa., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 13706) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13707) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 13708) providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BAER: A bill (H. R. 13709) to create a department of education and human welfare and to arrange for the co-operation between the Federal Government and the States in the encouragement and support of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 13710) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Roodhouse, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13711) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Carrollton, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13712) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mount Sterling, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13713) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Winchester, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13714) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of White Hall, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 13715) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Jefferson Davis Home Association one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 13716) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Woman's College, Hattiesburg, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13717) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Mississippi State Normal College, Hattiesburg, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13718) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Gulf Coast Military Academy, Gulfport, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13719) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the St. Stanislaus College, Bay St. Louis, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13720) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Covington, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13721) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Stone, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13722) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Simpson, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13723) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Perry, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13724) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Pearl River, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13725) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Lamar, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13726) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Marion, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13727) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Lawrence, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13728) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Jones, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13729) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Wayne, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13730) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Forrest, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13731) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of George, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13732) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Greene, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13733) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Hancock, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13734) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Harrison, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13735) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Jackson, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13736) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Jefferson Davis, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 13737) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Amarillo, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13738) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Childress, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13739) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Memphis, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13740) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Quanah, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13741) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Clarendon, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13742) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lubbock, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13743) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Snyder, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13744) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Plainview, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13745) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Canadian, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13746) for the erection of a public building in the city of Lubbock, the county seat of Lubbock County, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13747) for the erection of a public building in the city of Plainview, the county seat of Hale County, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13748) for the erection of a public building in the city of Canadian, the county seat of Hemphill County,

State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 13749) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Medford, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13750) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cambridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 13751) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hopkinton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13752) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Worcester, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13753) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Blackstone, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13754) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Uxbridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13755) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Northbridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13756) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Milford, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13757) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Westboro, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 13758) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Melrose, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13759) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fall River, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 13760) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Paris, Ky., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 13761) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to each of the cities of Americus, Cordele, and Fitzgerald, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAIGE: A bill (H. R. 13762) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Gardner, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13763) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Princetown, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13764) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Palmer, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13765) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Marre, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13766) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Orange, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13767) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Monson, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13768) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Athol, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13769) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Webster, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13770) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Holden, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13771) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lancaster, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13772) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Brookfield, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13773) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Spencer, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13774) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Leominster, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13775) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Warren, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13776) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ashby, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13777) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ashburnham, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13778) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dudley, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13779) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Oxford, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13780) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Southbridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13781) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Clinton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13782) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fitchburg, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13783) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Winchendon, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13784) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Templeton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13785) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sturbridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13786) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sterling, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 13787) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Breckenridge, Wilkin County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13788) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Roseau, Roseau County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13789) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Red Lake Falls, Red Lake County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13790) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Crookston, Polk County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13791) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Detroit, Becker County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13792) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Thief River Falls, Pennington County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13793) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Warren, Marshall County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13794) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hallock, Kittson County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13795) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Moorhead, Clay County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13796) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ada, Norman County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13797) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fergus Falls, Ottertail County, Minn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13798) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mahanomen, Mahanomen County, Minn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13799) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bagley, Clearwater County, Minn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: Resolution (H. Res. 495) requesting the President of the United States to open negotiations with the Republic of Mexico for the purchase of the peninsula of Lower California and contiguous territory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHERLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 496) for the consideration of House bill 13708; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 497) providing for the consideration of Senate bill 714; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LaGUARDIA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 379) authorizing the War Department to employ civilians to perform clerical and manual work in order to insure the immediate discharge of soldiers now performing such duties; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 13800) for the relief of claimants of certain unsurveyed lands in Mississippi County, Ark.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 13801) granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Hand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 13802) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant to John D. Sherwood, of Spokane, Wash., the right to overflow certain lands on the Fort George Wright Military Reservation, at Spokane, Wash., and to accept the conveyance to the United States of other lands to be designated by the Secretary of War and suitable for a rifle range in exchange for the land so overflowed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 13803) granting an increase of pension to Catherine McQuade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 13804) granting a pension to William Unfug; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 13805) granting an increase of pension to John W. Paulus; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLAND: A bill (H. R. 13806) for the relief of the Eastern Transportation Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 13807) authorizing the Postmaster General to cancel or readjust the screen-wagon contract of H. L. McFarlin, of Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 13808) granting a pension to Annie K. Squier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 13809) granting a pension to Bridget Finan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 13810) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 13811) granting an increase of pension to Walter R. D. Vaughan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13812) granting a pension to Phillip Lockwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 13813) granting a pension to Sarah Jane Vanpelt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13814) striking from the pension roll the name of Sylvester Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (13815) granting a pension to George J. Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 13816) granting a pension to Eliza K. Leman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 13817) for the relief of Jose Lopez Castelo; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13818) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Huntley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13819) granting an increase of pension to R. Franklin Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13820) granting an increase of pension to William L. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Resolutions by Charles Schloeg, of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to the price of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Resolutions adopted at a meeting of county superintendents of schools of Wisconsin, urging enactment of legislation to provide for a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Senate of Porto Rico, praying the Congress of the United States to aid victims of earthquakes in Porto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Lumberman's Exchange, of St. Louis, favoring placing the railroads under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Federal Labor Union, No. 15034, American Federation of Labor, of Streator, Ill., favoring a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Resolutions by representative business men of the town of White Pigeon, Mich., praying support of Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Resolutions by the common council of the city of New Britain, Conn., relating to the independence of Ireland and other countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution by the Portland (Oreg.) Traffic and Transportation Association, to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission the powers taken away by the Federal control act of March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions by the Vallejo (Cal.) Employees' Union, No. 76, recommending Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions by the Western Pine Manufacturing Association, petitioning the restoration to the Interstate Commerce Commission of the powers taken from it under the Federal control act of March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of West Coast Lumberman's Association to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission the rights taken from it by the act of March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of F. H. Staub, of Fergus Falls, Minn., relating to taxes on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Oscar M. Sullivan, chairman Commission on Rehabilitation of Industrial Cripples, St. Paul, Minn., urging early and favorable action upon Senate bill 4922 and House bill 12880; to the Committee on Education.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 8, 1919.

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we stand before Thee with bowed heads and sorrowing hearts as a great leader, among the leaders of the Nation, is being laid to his final rest. Peace be to his ashes and rest to his soul.

A Nation is in tears. Many distinguished men, who loved and admired him for his sterling qualities, his energy, skill, and undaunted courage, will give their presence to the last rites that mortals can bestow upon the dead. Their tears will mingle with the tears of the bereaved wife and children.

Comfort them, we beseech Thee, with the promise handed down to us out of the ages.

There is no death! What seems so is transition;
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life elysian,
Whose portal we call Death.

Thus comfort the Nation and the world and inspire the living with an earnest desire to follow his illustrious example; and Thine be the glory through Christ the Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolu-

tions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 5192. An act for the construction of a bridge across Rock River at or near Jackson Street, in the city of Janesville, Wis.; S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution for relief in Alaska; and S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution requesting the Commission of Fine Arts to submit to the Congress certain suggestions.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 4240. An act for the relief of Alma Harris.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill and joint resolutions of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 5192. An act for the construction of a bridge across Rock River at or near Jackson Street, in the city of Janesville, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution for relief in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution requesting the Commission of Fine Arts to submit to Congress certain suggestions; to the Committee on the Library.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BRAND, for 10 days, on account of illness; and
To Mr. MAYS, at the request of Mr. WELLING, indefinitely, on account of serious illness in his family.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communications, which were read:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., January 6, 1919.

HON. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I hereby resign my office as Representative in the Congress of the United States from the at-large district of Pennsylvania.

Very sincerely,

JOHN R. K. SCOTT.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., January 7, 1919.

SECRETARY TO HON. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

My resignation to take effect January 5, 1919.

JOHN R. K. SCOTT.

RECESS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect to the distinguished ex-President of the United States, Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, whose funeral will presently take place, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 2 o'clock p. m. as a mark of respect to the memory of the late Theodore Roosevelt. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

AFTER THE RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire on what subject the gentleman intends to address the House?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to present to the House through a letter received from a sailor boy what I consider a very grave hardship which is being suffered by many sailors whose applications for discharge have been already approved.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the gentleman taken it up with the Navy Department?

Mr. POU. If the gentleman will refrain from making that request I will yield him five minutes on the discussion on the rule I now present.

Mr. BLANTON. I will be glad to do so.

MARY C. CARPENTER.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.